

A
PRESERVATIVE
Against several
ABUSES and CORRUPTIONS
OF
Reveal'd Religion:
CONTAINING
REMARKS
ON

A late Book of Mr. Joseph Hallet, jun^r
INTITLED,
A Collection of Notes, &c.

By JOHN ENTY.

EXON:

Printed by ANDREW BRICE, for AARON
TOZER, jun^r Bookseller, at the Bible, a
little below St. Martin's Lane, in the High-
street. MDCCXXX. (Price 2 s.)

RESERVATIVE
 AGENTS AND CORRESPONDENTS
 OF

Revealed Religions
 CONTAINING



R E
 K S

A list Book of Mr. J. J. J. J. J.

INTITLED
 A Collection of Notes, &c.

By JOHN ENTY.

FROM
 Printed by ANDREW BRICE for AARON
 LAMBERT, at the SIGN of
 the BELL in St. Martin's Lane & the
 (over 20) MDCCCXX.



THE PREFACE.



I hath long been a matter of much painful concern to me to observe the many different and bold attacks that have, of late years, been made upon religion, and that both by its professed enemies and pretended friends. This, I am sensible, hath done a great deal of mischief: And therefore it becomes every one that would be thought a friend of religion and virtue to obviate the farther mischief that every new assault upon any part of divine revelation is likely to do. 'Tis very much upon this account, and not from any pleasure I take in religious controversies, that I determin'd to make some animadversions on a late performance of Mr. Joseph Hallet, jun' viz. *A collection of notes and discourses*, in which, I humbly apprehend, are a great many things that are of very dangerous consequence to the interest of religion. 'Tis hard indeed to guess what this author could design in a great many things he is pleas'd to advance: For tho' he

* 2

himself

himself allows them to be very reasonable, as particularly the *doxology* at the end of the Lord's-prayer, saying grace *after* meat, &c. yet notwithstanding he opposeth them with a great deal of *warmth*. What therefore his end could be I can't so well conceive, unless perhaps he was willing (according to his own intimation, *preface* p. 5.) to let the world see that he had some *unfashionable notions* besides that which he mentions, and that he thinks out of the *common road*. And if this had been all, and these notions had been no way hurtful, and undermining as to *religion* and *virtue*, I could very easily have past by such *unfashionable fancies*, as I have several, and left them to the admiration and fond caresses of their own author. But when an attempt is made to turn people out of an old beaten road, that is very safe, and put them in no other, but where 'tis hard (if possible) to avoid their being lost and bewild'rd, this can't be friendly to mankind, tho' the author, by his odd and out-of-the-way method of thinking, may aspire at the character of an *uncommon man*; and as to some may reach his *vain design*.

There are many other ways wherein a man hath scope enough to shew his learning without falling foul upon any part of *natural* or *revel'd religion*: But when any shall attempt to raise a reputation upon what many justly take to be the *ruins* of these which are of common concern, and the utmost importance to mankind, 'tis far from being an unkindness to such persons themselves, and must be acceptable to all the friends of religion and goodness, to have such *whims* and *nostrums* in divinity set in a true light. And as to myself, I own, that I take it
to

The PREFACE, v.

to be a *debt* that I owe to *God* and *religion*, to my *fellow-christians* in general, and my own people in particular, to support the interest of *faith* and *holiness* in the best manner I can. And I confess, it gave me no small pleasure that so many of my *very considerable friends* * were pleas'd to signify it as their earnest desire, that something might be done to obviate the mischief that Mr. H's notions were likely to do. I thought I could not so effectually answer their desires, which were, and always will be, of very great weight with me, as by appearing thus publicly against that which they had in so just a detestation.

'Twas never my design in this undertaking to consider minutely every exceptionable thing in this author's performance. I have therefore singled out what I thought to be most gross, and most likely to debauch mens *principles* and *manners*; and this I hope will be in some sort sufficient to prevent the mischief of several others that I now pass by. I intended to give his twelfth and last discourse about the immortality of the soul and a future state, p. 210, &c. a distinct and very particular consideration: For tho' he therein pretends to be a friend to revelation, yet he plainly saps the foundation of a great part of *natural religion*, and so prepares men for *atheism*, and all *ill practices*, out of a professed zeal against *deism*. As to *deism* itself, I take it to be of such pernicious consequence, that it deserves the warmest of

* Among which was my worthy friend Mr. Vowler, who hath himself publish'd some just remarks on the said book, being obliged to it by Mr. Hallet's unrighteous treatment of him.

of rational opposition. However, I can't but think it a very odd way to sacrifice *natural religion* to support *reveal'd*. Many have made it abundantly evident, to the eternal shame and reproach of *deism*, that *revelation* may be defended another way, and without any such shameful and dangerous expence as this. But I must drop what I intended in answer to this discourse, being assured that another had undertaken a reply thereto; which tho' I han't seen, yet conclude, from the known learning and abilities of the person engag'd therein, that 'twill be satisfactory to the world.

As to Mr. H—r's first discourse, p. 89, &c. which I have past by, he speaks of it himself as an unfinish'd discourse: And for this reason I shall give it no other consideration at present than just to observe, that the enemies of revelation can take no just advantage from these few and very inconsiderable differences that there are between the *old* and *new testament*. And that therefore 'tis but an ill piece of service to suggest, that we need another old testament. The very learned *Glassius*, who well understood what he writ about, was quite of another mind, and would not give *infidels*, and the enemies of revelation, such a handle as Mr. *Whiston* and Mr. H—r have done. He vindicates the purity of the *Hebrew* text in a long and very learned discourse, * which might probably be of considerable service to Mr. H—r, if he should think fit to consult it before he writes any more upon this subject. This might perhaps convince him, that the cavils of *infidels* and *papists*

* *Glassii* philol. sacra in principio.

papists upon this head have nothing in them that should stagger or disturb any *christian* or *protestant*; and that accordingly he might have employ'd both his time and learning better than to fill peoples heads with *scruples* and *objections* about that in which they have reason to be very easy.

Mr. H—t's fourth discourse, p. 113, &c. concerning a passage in Bp. *Patrick's* commentaries, doth no way affect the interest of religion; and therefore I pass it over, with this single observation, that 'tis not very material whether he or the Bishop be in the right.

Mr. H—t's fifth discourse about the *septuagint*, p. 118, &c. hath very little or nothing that's liable to objection. 'Tis well known to the learned, that Mr. H—t is not the first that hath complain'd concerning what's call'd the *septuagint translation*: For tho' some of the *ancients* might speak a little extravagantly concerning some parts of it, yet others of them do complain very heavily of it, as particularly *Jerom* very frequently, and before him *Justin Martyr* in his dialogue with *Trypho the Jew*, as also *Origen*, who endeavour'd to correct it in a great many places. And so amongst the *moderns*, *Bel-larmine*, *Huntleius*, *Mafius*, &c. besides a great many *protestant writers*. So that Mr. H—t's objections against this translation are too common and ancient to allow him the honour that he seems to aim at in this discourse.

Mr. H's 6th discourse, p. 129, &c. about *anger* is so very mean and trifling, that I design'd at first to pass it by without any remark: But as I did not know but his observation, p. 130. and what he adds, p. 132. might do mischief to some persons, so I thought it proper to bestow a short

short animadversion or two upon it. What he says is, 'That anger in the new testament is never spoken of with allowance, but in superiours towards their inferiours, and that christians must not be angry with their superiours or equals upon any pretence whatsoever, and that the scripture forbids us to be angry with our superiours or equals.' But what Mr. H—t says upon this head is altogether without foundation. There is no doubt but superiours may have very just occasion to be angry with their inferiours: But where do the scriptures forbid all anger with our superiours or equals? Mr. H—t can't but allow that there's an equality between the brethren that our Saviour speaks of *Mat. v. 22.* and yet, when he forbids brethren in this place *to be angry* with one another *without cause*, this doth plainly suppose that there may be very just occasion to be angry with them; and all that we are to be cautious about is, that we don't give way to *rash and causeless anger*. 'Tis very odd to say, that we mayn't be angry with our brother because our equal, when by his untoward carriage towards God, or others, or ourselves, he gives provocation. We must not suffer our anger to rise too high, or to continue so long as that the *sun*, in the scripture sense, *should go down upon our wrath*; But not to be angry when there is just provocation, is in some cases to countenance, and in others to approve and encourage, wickedness. Again, Mr. H—t must allow that parents are superiour to their children; and yet they must not provoke their children to wrath, *Eccl. Ephes. vi. 4.* or, as the word *παροργίζει* signifies, stir them up to anger. 'Tis a just occasion for children to be angry when their pa-
rents

rents are cruel and unnatural, neglect their souls or bodies, or through fondness to some, and disregard to others, make these causeless distinctions that parents many times do between their children. 'Tis sinful in parents to do this; but no fault in children to resent it. And no more is it in subjects or servants to resent the *arbitrariness*, *tyranny*, and *barbarity* of their *rulers* or *masters*. All that is culpable in such resentments is when they are suffer'd to rise too high, or run too far. So that all the anger the scripture forbids is sinful and irregular anger. Inferiours and equals may have just provocation to be angry, as well as their superiours; but when they have, they must never be excessive; and this extends to those of the highest rank, as well as those of the lowest degree. So that for Mr. H—t to talk, that there is a mark of superiority in the nature of anger is very weak; but yet may occasion many doubts and perplexities to weak consciences, and also do much hurt in other respects. And this must be my excuse that I have taken so much notice of this *poor discourse*.

As to several of Mr. H—t's other discourses, I have given them a more distinct and particular consideration; and shall very much rejoice, if any thing I have said may be of any service to himself, or other persons.

There are several of Mr. H—t's notes that deserve consideration, as well as his discourses. But 'twould swell my remarks to too great a bulk to consider all that's exceptionable in them. I have some thoughts therefore to offer some few animadversions that I have by me on the most obnoxious passages in a short preface,

to these discourses on the *fourth commandment*, which I have promised the world in a little time : But before I can have leisure or opportunity for this, I can't but take notice, that Mr. *H—t* in his preface, p. 5. would have the world believe, that all that he advanceth in his notes on texts of scripture is new, except one passage that hath the same interpretation given it by Sir *Norton Knatchbull*. For this one *vain repetition*, as he calls it himself, he hopes the reader will forgive him, because undesign'd. But if this be a vain repetition, Mr. *H—t* begins his notes with the like vain repetition : For Mr. *Pool*, in his *synopsis criticorum*, hath the same remark on II. *Kings* xxiv. 13. that Mr. *H—t* hath ; and tho' I won't say that it is, yet Mr. *H—t*'s seems to be little more than a translation of what Mr. *Pool* says.

Mr. *H—t*'s remark on the second text, *Ezra* viii. 35. p. 1. seems to be very useless ; for if we read the whole verse, we can't well be at any loss to understand who those children were ; for they are spoken of as the *representatives* of all that were carried away captive.

Mr. *H—t*'s remarks on the third text, viz. *Psa.* li. 14, 16, 19. p. 2, 3, 4, 5, I think are perfectly groundless ; and he must be a very weak Jew that could be confounded with any thing that could justly be offer'd from this *Psalms*. Nor is there the least reason to think from verse 16. that when the *Jews* are converted, and own Christ to be their Lord and God, that then God will again restore the *Jewish* worship. 'Tis certain that their *rites*, *sacrifices*, *ceremonies*, were all abolish'd by the death of Christ, and will never be restor'd more. And I wonder Mr.

H—t

H--- of all men should talk of their *altars, offerings, and sacrifices* being restor'd again, when he pleads, there's an utter abolition of the *Jewish* religion, even of the ten commandments as well as the rest. All that the psalmist seems to intend in the 19th verse is, to offer up a prayer for the church of God, that it might be in a more prosperous condition. And this prayer of his was fully answer'd in the Days of his son *Solomon*. These few hints may serve as a *specimen* of the great discoveries *Mr. H---* hath made of the meaning of texts by studying the scriptures.

But I am not willing to shut up this preface without making a remark on what *Mr. H.* hath said on one text more, *viz.* on *John* xvii. 3. p. 14, 15, *The only true God.* *Mr. H---*'s note here is, 'This expression signifies the same as the alone most high and supreme God. The true God signifies the same as the chief God, the God by way of emphasis, the God in the most famous and extraordinary sense.' And to prove that the true God here meant chief, he quotes several texts where the word true, as he thinks, signifies chief, and then concludes, p. 15, That the true God here signifies the chief, or supreme God. As therefore this passage is by *St. John* apply'd to the *Father*, so *Mr. H---*'s intention could be no other than to prove, that our blessed Saviour is not in his language chief, or supreme God. He doth not here seem to lay the stress of his proof, as others have done, who deny Christ's proper Godhead, upon the *exclusive particle*. This he seems sensible would not bear the weight that some *Arians* and *Socinians* have laid upon it and he could not but

know, that this has been sufficiently baffled. His method therefore is to shew, that true God signifies *chief* or *supreme* God. But if this remark of Mr. H---t's be true, it must (tho' very contrary to his intention and inclinations) for ever ruin the *Arian cause*: For our Saviour in one of the texts that Mr. H---t quotes is call'd the *true light*, i. e. as Mr. H---t explains it, the light in the most famous and extraordinary sense of the word, or the *chief* or *best* light, as he explains the like phrase, p. 15. So that according to Mr. H---t's way of arguing, he must, by consequence be God *supreme*; for as St. John says, I. John i. 5. *God is light*. 'Tis undoubtedly of the *supreme* God that St. John here speaks, *He is light*. Our Saviour therefore being the *true light*, or light (according to Mr. H---t) in the most famous and extraordinary sense of the word, by a most easy and natural inference, he must be God *supreme*. But farther, our Saviour is expressly said to be the *true God*, I. John v. 20. Dr. Whitby and others (to whom for brevity I refer the reader) have made it undeniably evident, that these words must belong to our blessed Saviour. As our Saviour is in scripture stil'd *God*, the *great God*, *God over all*, &c. so here he is represented by the apostle as the true God, in opposition to all these *idols*, *false* and *imaginary gods*, whom the heathens worship'd. If therefore true and supreme do signify the same, as (according to Mr. H---t) they do, then our Saviour must be *supreme* God by Mr. H---t's own argument; and if so, Mr. H---t can never excuse it, if he doth not own and honour him as such, and also teach his people to do so. I might in my remarks have observ'd

The PREFACE.

xiii.

observ'd how very *harsh* it sounds to talk, as Mr. H--- doth, of a *chief* God, which implies that christians have *another* God that is not *chief*; which in a *heathen* author would not have been so strange, because the *heathens* hold that there is such a *chief* God, and other Gods of an *inferiour* rank and *station*; but this in one who pretends to be a *christian* *divine* is very *gross* and *shocking*: But I chus'd upon this head to argue *ad hominem*. And may God grant, that it may have this good effect upon Mr. Hallet, even to bring him to own our *blessed* *Saviour* to be the *living* and *true* God.



The

The CONTENTS.

MR. Haller's second discourse examin'd, and Bp. Pearson, &c. vindicated, page 1.

Mr. H—t guilty of what he unjustly charges on Bp. Pearson, p. 5.

Mr. Haller's third discourse examin'd, and the knowledge of the Son of God prov'd to be infinite, and equal to that of the Father, p. 7.

Christ the efficient cause and proper creator of the world, p. 9.

Christ knows the Father in the same manner the Father knows him, p. 11.

Christ prayed to as omniscient by the apostles, p. 14.

Omniscience ascribed to Christ in the fullest and strongest terms that 'tis to the supream God, p. 16.

None ought to put restrictions and limitations to the knowledge of Christ, when the apostles put none, p. 18.

Objections against our Saviour's omniscience from Mat. xxiv. 36. and Mark xiii. 32. fully answer'd, p. 19.

Mr. Haller's seventh discourse examin'd; and the doxology at the end of the Lord's-prayer, in St. Matthew, prov'd to be a part of sacred scripture, p. 33.

It's justifiable for christians to praise Father, Son, and Holy Ghost in their doxologies, since they were devoted to them in their baptism, and are warranted to pray to them in the II. Corinthians xiii. 14. p. 37.

The directory given by our Lord would be imperfect, if the doxology at the end of the Lord's-prayer, in Matthew,

CONTENTS!

xv.

Matthew vi. be not part of sacred scripture, there being in it no other direction about praise, p. 44.
This doxology could not be taken from the liturgies, because more ancient than any liturgy that can be produc'd; for you have not one word or syllable of them in any of the writings of the three first centuries, p. 52.

Mr. Hallet's eighth discourse examin'd, and the ten commandments prov'd to be still in force, and to oblige christians, p. 59.

A collection of some of Mr. H—t's assertions, that the ten commandments were given to the Jews only, and don't oblige christians, that they are abolish'd, and cease to be a rule to the church of God, p. 61, 62.

Mr. Hallet persuaded Mr. Peirce to leave the ten commandments out of his catechism, p. 63.

The first commandment will be for ever irreconcilable to Mr. Hallet's notion of worshipping any besides the one God, p. 65.

That which the fourth commandment requires is, that we should keep holy to the Lord a seventh part of time, or the day after six days of labour, p. 72.

Mr. Hallet's great presumption to tell what God would have done, or not have done, when God himself hath told us no such thing, p. 84.

The ten commandments were distinguish'd from the rest by God himself, and not at the complaints and remonstrances of the people, p. 85.

Moral precepts bind all persons, and at all times, p. 86.

The new testament no where declares, that the ten commandments are abolish'd, p. 93.

Mr. Hallet's pretending he says no more than Mr. Baxter hath said before him, prov'd to be false, and a mere evasion, p. 95.

Mr. Baxter says, that neither the words nor the sense of the ten commandments are to be taken literally, but of

- of these laws that were written on the tables of stone were alter'd by Christ, p. 95.
- There is no foundation in scripture for Mr. H—t's assertion, that the apostles were not ministers to promulgate the ten Commandments, p. 101.
- If Christ had abolish'd the ten Commandments, he directed the young man to a way to eternal life that he himself had block'd up, p. 100.
- The apostle in the I. Timothy i. 8. had his eye on the ten commands, all which in effect he doth there enumerate, (except one) p. 103.
- Mr. Hallet discourages parents from teaching the ten commandments to their children, p. 118.
- Mr. Peirce, according to Mr. Hallet's representation, would have the world believe, that he thought the ten commandments to be binding on christians, when it seems at the same time he believ'd no such thing, p. 119.
- Instances of several things Mr. Hallet would have children taught instead of the ten commandments, p. 120.
- Mr. Hallet's ninth discourse examin'd, and some very great defects in Mr. P—ce's catechism, and Mr. Hallet's method of catechising laid open, p. 120.
- Many of Mr. Hallet's questions are foreign to the purpose of that scripture he attempts to explain, p. 121.
- Mr. Hallet asserts the Commands of the old testament were particularly given to the Jews, and the promises of the old testament peculiarly made to them, p. 122.
- The scriptures of the old testament recommended by Timothy, as those that were able to make us wise to salvation, p. 123.
- Instances of laws taken from the old testament, and urg'd in the new, p. 124.
- Many promises of the old testament extend to all good

CONTENTS.

xvii

good men, and are apply'd by Christ and his apostles to christians in the new testament, 125, 126.

Mr. Peirce's catechism calculated rather to benefit the memory than inform the judgment, p. 130.

The Assembly's catechism answers the end of catechising to greater advantage than Mr. Peirce's can; an instance given, viz. that of repentance, p. 131.

Mr. P—ce in his catechism omits many things of great moment, and the last importance in reveal'd religion, p. 132.

Mr. P—ce attempts to rob our Saviour and Sanctifier of their highest glory, p. 132.

Mr. P—ce's catechism seems intirely silent as to the worshipping of Christ, p. 133.

If Christians don't worship Christ with religious worship, they don't honour the Son as they honour the Father, p. 134. That command supposeth Christ to be truly and properly God, p. 136.

The apostles and primitive christians did pray to Christ, and intreat others to pray to him on their behalf, p. 139, 140, 141.

Such can't come up to the character of Christians who don't pay Christ religious worship, and yet those that do pay it to him are guilty of Idolatry, if he be not God, p. 143.

Christ's divinity not a matter of pure speculation, but of the last importance, p. 145, 146.

Christ hath the same nature, excellencies and perfections that the Father hath, does the same works the Father doth, and is to receive the same homage and worship that is due to the supream God, p. 151, 152.

We have no argument to prove the deity of the Father, that we have not to prove the deity of the Son, p. 156.

Mr.

Mr. Hallet's tenth discourse examin'd, wherein his notion of saying grace, and applying it to the Lord's supper is shewn not only to be groundless, but of ill tendency to religion, and particularly to bring the Lord's supper into contempt, and St. Paul vindicated from an infamous reproach that is cast upon him, p. 160.

We ought to join petition with our thanksgivings at our common meals, p. 165.

When ever christians practise the duty of prayer or thanksgiving, they should never be shy of the name of Christ, p. 167.

Christians expressly commanded alway to give thanks in the name of Christ, p. 168.

The general commands of giving thanks to God alway oblige us to give thanks to God, not only for creatures, but for refreshment and nourishment by them, p. 172.

Mr. Hallet's eleventh discourse examin'd, and his notion of an earthly paradise exposed, and proved to be directly contrary to what the scriptures offers concerning the place where good men shall dwell after the resurrection, p. 174.

Mr. H—t's paradise, tho' not the same, yet very like that of Mahomet, p. 176.

Mr. H—t's paradise unscriptural, p. 177.

The word heaven does signify the place in which good men shall dwell after the judgment-day, p. 178.

St. Peter speaks of the future happiness of the saints, as reserv'd in heaven for them, p. 178. and St. Paul speaks of it as eternal in the heavens, p. 181. but Mr. Hallet left out the word eternal when he quoted that text.

Mr. Hallet talks unitelligibly, when he says, that the house, the hope, the inheritance, the substance, the treasure, the place prepared for believers, is

CONTENTS.

xx.

now in heaven, and that when the new Jerusalem comes down, these things shall come down in and with it, p. 182.

Heaven is not only fit for separate souls but for souls embodied also ; in heaven is the body our saviour assum'd, p. 190. and surely it must be fit for ours, when made like to his glorious body, when it is for his own.

Mr. Hallet's query, Where can the heaven be of which they speak ? answered, and he told, It is in the same place where the body of our Lord, of Enoch, and Elias now are, p. 190.

The new heavens and new earth, of which St. John speaks, are to be understood in a metaphorical, and not in a literal, sense, p. 193.

The place Mr. Hallet hath assign'd for the residence of good men after the resurrection too narrow for all that are saved, p. 194.



ERRATA.

E R R A T A.

PAge 3. Line 25. after *oiber* add *great*. p. 8. l. 34.
 read *perhaps*. p. 31. l. 8. r. *plain*. p. 36. l.
 38. after *but* r. *what every one that is not*. p. 40. l. 12.
 for *his* r. *is*. p. 44. l. 20. r. *Learned*. p. 52. l. 28.
 r. *produced*. p. 64. l. 5. leave out *the*. p. 67. l. 22.
 after *that* r. *This author of the Fable of the Bees*. p. 70.
 l. 14. for *sence* r. *sense*. p. 73. l. 5. r. *be*. p. 88. l. 14.
 or *apople* r. *apostle*. p. 90. l. 35. for *perceptively* r.
preceptively. p. 98. l. 20, leave out *not*. l. 21. r. *Hal-*
let's. p. 97. l. 35 for *it* r. *if*. p. 138. l. 34. for *rile* r.
title. p. 142. l. 22. r. *obligation*. p. 162. l. 5. after
creatures r. p. 185. p. 163. l. 15. for 158. r. 185. p.
 180. l. 37. for *understood* r. *understand*.

There are several *Errata* in the *Pointing*, which
 the candid Reader is desired to correct.



REMARKS

ON

A late Performance of Mr. *Joseph Hallet, Jun' &c.*

Mr. Hallet's second Discourse, p. 105, &c. examin'd, and Bishop PEARSON, &c. vindicated.



I HAVE in the Preface given an Account, why no Notice is taken of several Things in Mr. H--t's late Performance; and this Chapter of his wou'd have deserv'd no particular Remark, if he had not discover'd such an *Air of Vanity* therein, and attempted to fasten this infamous Reproach upon Bp. Pearson, and Two other very Great and Learned Persons, as if they had asserted something as a Matter of Fact, which they had not sufficiently examin'd whether it was really *Fact* or no, p. 108. And if those

A

Great

Great Persons had really done what they are charg'd with, I shou'd not have attempted their Vindication : For, however highly I might value their Learning, and great Abilities, I have no Persons, or Names, in so much Veneration, as to venture at an Apology for a Practice that might, one Time or other, be of very ill Consequence to the World.

There is no Person, how Great soever, that ought to be excused, that shall endeavour to palm those Things upon the World, as true, that are really false. This ought not to be done in the slightest Cases, lest Men, by habituating themselves to so *vile* a Practice, in lesser Matters, should be too much inclin'd to do it in greater, when a Temptation offers. If then, Mr. H—t had any Reason for, or had been any way able to support his Charge, it must have rested as a *Blot* upon the Character of those truly Great and Learned Persons that he falls upon; and no one cou'd have blam'd him for his warm and pathological Exclamation, p. 107. ' What Need had we to see with our own Eyes, and not blindly to trust any Guides! And how careful should Writers be, not to assert any Thing as a Matter of Fact, before they have sufficiently examin'd, whether it be really Fact or not.' But then, if those Great Men Mr. H—t hath thus charg'd be entirely clear of the Imputation, and he himself hath done that *vile Thing* that he charges others with, and which must have greatly eclips'd their Reputation, if it had been really true; the Slander must return upon himself, and sink the Credit of his Enquiries and Assertions in other Matters. But to come to the Charge itself.

Mr.

Mr. *H—t*, p. 105, says, ‘ That the very
 ‘ Great and Learned Bp. *Pearson*, in his excel-
 ‘ lent Exposition of the Creed, says, on the
 ‘ Sixth Article, that there is a Difference, in
 ‘ the Language of the *Greeks*, between that
 ‘ Word that is render’d, *Almighty*, in the *first*
 ‘ Article, and that which is so render’d in the
 ‘ *sixth*, because that more peculiarly signifieth
 ‘ Authority of Dominion, this more properly
 ‘ Power in Operation. He adds, says Mr.
 ‘ *H—t*, in the Margin, in the *first* Article,
 ‘ it is παντοκράτωρ, in the sixth παντοδυναμος.
 He goes on, ‘ Dr. *Tower*son on the Creed says
 ‘ the same, p. 75: and after them the Learned,
 ‘ Judicious, and Excellent Author of the *Criti-*
 ‘ *cal History of the Creed*, p. 282, 283. says the
 ‘ same.’ That which Mr. *H—t* blames those
 Great Men for is not for the different Meaning
 of these two *Greek* Words: This he says is un-
 doubtedly just: But that which he condemns
 Bp. *Pearson* for, is, that he had not sufficient
 Authority for what he asserts, and that he wrote
 the above-mention’d Remark by his Memory
 that fail’d him, p. 107. That which he con-
 demns the other Men for, is, ‘ That they took
 ‘ Bp. *Pearson*’s Word for it, without examining;
 ‘ as he says, he hath known another Great Man
 ‘ also do, and he believes most Learned Men
 ‘ still do’.

Would not any one think (after such an Ac-
 cusation) that the Learned Mr. *H—t* would
 be tho’t to be more cautious, that he sees e-
 very Thing that he asserts with his own Eyes,
 and doth not blindly trust to any Guides?
 But if this had been really the Case, he could
 never have blunder’d so notoriously; and mu-
 ster’d up such a groundless Charge. I won’t

here enquire, with what *Sincerity* Mr. H---t could call Bp. *Pearson's Exposition* of the *Creed* (without Exception) an excellent Exposition, when the Bishop doth so strongly assert, and so clearly prove, the proper *Deity* of our *Saviour* and the *Holy Ghost*, which Doctrines Mr. H---t thinks to be unintelligible *Jargon*: Nor do I think it worth a while to examine, whether Mr. H---t hath seen, or understands, the several *Creeds*, and *Catechisms*, he pretends (with such a *Shew* of his great Reading and Learning) to have look'd into. Only as to that which is call'd the *Athanasian Creed*, I would observe, that in one of the *Greek Copies* of it that I have seen, namely that of *Patricius Junius*,* there is neither the Word παντοκράτορ, nor πασιδυναμς. Both the Words are us'd several Times in the *Creed*; but this Article is express'd thus, ἐν ἁβυσσῶν ἐν δεξιᾷ τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ πατρὸς; but whether that in the *Polyglot* or this of *Junius* be the truest and best Edition, 'tis not worth a while to examine. However, thus much may be inferr'd from these two different Editions of what is call'd the *Athanasian Creed*, that nothing can be gather'd from it to support Mr. H---t's Charge against Bp. *Pearson*, &c. Nay, tho' it should be allow'd, that the Edition in the *Polyglot* is better than that of *Junius*, yet this won't excuse Mr. H---t's Rashness, in charging such considerable Men as Bp. *Pearson*, &c. as he doth.

Mr. H---t says, p. 107, he hath reckon'd up Twelve Editions of the ' *Greek Creed*, besides the *Hebrew* and *Syriack* Versions of it; but

* *Vsserii Diatrib. de Eccles. Romana Symbolo* &c. p. 26. &c.

‘ but hath not been able as yet to find one Instance to the contrary.’ But is it not very strange, that Mr. H---t should be so laborious (as he pretends) in his Enquiries, and tell us, how the Word in the *sixth* Article is rendered in the *Hebrew*, yea, in the *Syriack*, and *German* too, and yet overlook what Bishop *Pearson* himself says in the Margin of his excellent Exposition? * Where he might have seen what Authority he had for saying, that the Word in the *first* Article rendered Almighty, is different from the Word in the *sixth* render’d Almighty. It can’t excuse Mr. H---t, who sets up for a very Great Critick, to say, as I have been told he doth, that this Marginal Reference is not in the Edition he us’d: For, as a Critick, he must know undoubtedly, that there are several Editions of Bp. *Pearson* on the Creed, as well as several Editions of the Creed itself. Is it not intolerable then to tell us, how the Words of the Creed are in this and the other Catechism, on purpose to shew his Learning, or run down Bp. *Pearson*, &c. and then lay his Charge, before he had consulted Bp. *Pearson* himself? Is not this blindly to trust Guides? Is not this to deliver Things to the World without Examination? Is not this to write History by Invention; which, as the Great Dr. *Waterland* well observes, † is really Romancing? But to let Mr. H---t see, what it seems he hath not seen before, to correct his *Vanity* a little, and make him more sparing of his groundless Censures for the future; I’ll throw the Creed
(tha

* *Pearson* on the Creed, 5th Edit. p. 46. † *Vindication of Christ’s Divin.* 3d Edit. p. 102.

(that Bp. *Pearson*, and the two other Great and Learned Persons, I suppose, refer to) into the Margin, which is in the antient Copy, lodg'd in the Library of *Bennet Colledge, Cambridge*, and set forth by A-Bp. *Ussher*. * 'Tis to this ancient Copy of the Creed that Bishop *Pearson* refers; and probably those two other Persons that fall under Mr. *H*——'s Censure: And by this the World hath a very flagrant Specimen what a careless Writer Mr. *H*—— is, and how rash and unjust his Censures are.

Mr. *H*——, I think, ought to make the most publick Satisfaction to the Great and Learned Person that is still living, and to do the like publick Justice to the Memories of those truly Great and Learned Persons that he hath so notoriously injur'd. If this be not done, his Words can never pass for any Slander, nor his Censures for any Thing more than bold Attempts to murder other Mens Reputations, that he may be the better enabled to offer more costly and pompous Sacrifices to his own *Vanity*. Mr.

* Πισθώ εις Θεον πατέρα παντοκράτορα, ποιητήν
 ἡρανὸν καὶ γῆς. Καὶ Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν υἱὸν ἀγνῶστον
 νοσητὴν τὸν κύριον ἡμῶν, τὸν συληθέντα ἐκ πνεύμα-
 τος ἁγίου, γεννηθέντα ἐκ Μαρίας τῆς παρθένου, πα-
 θόντα ἐπὶ Ποντίῳ Πιλάτῳ, σταυρωθέντα, δαμέντα, καὶ
 ταφέντα, κατελθόντα εἰς τὰ κατώτατα. τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ
 ἀναστάντα ἀπὸ τῶν νεκρῶν. ἀνελθόντα εἰς τὸν ἡραν,
 καθεζόμενον ἐν δεξιᾷ τοῦ πατρὸς πανταδυναμῶν. Εκεί-
 νου, ἐρχόμενον κρῖναι ζῶντας καὶ νεκρούς. Πισθώ εις
 τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, ἁγίαν καθολικὴν ἐκκλησίαν, ἀ-
 γίων κοινωνίαν, ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν, σαρκοῦ ἀνάστασιν,
 ζωὴν αἰώνιον. Ἀμήν. *Ussher. Diatrib. de Rom. Eccl.*
Symbo. &c. p. 9.

Mr. H---'s Third Discourse, p. 108, &c. examin'd; and the Knowledge of the Son of God prov'd to be infinite, and equal to that of the Father.

THERE is no one that reads the Title of this Third Discourse, (*viz.* The Son of God knows the Thoughts of Men) but would imagine (if he knew nothing of the Author) that he intended to assert the *Knowledge* of our Saviour in the strongest Terms, to assert that he was omniscient, because, to know the Tho'ts, or Heart, which is the same, is represented in Scripture as the utmost Extent and highest Eminency of Knowledge, as a Knowledge that's peculiar, and appropriated to, and the sole Prerogative of God. But 'tis evident, from the Conclusion of the Chapter, p. 113. That Mr. H---t intended no such Thing. For here he plainly insinuates, that the Knowledge of our Saviour is but an inferiour limited Knowledge. That there are some Things that he doth not know. ' That as Christ knows us, because he ' made our Souls, and gave us all our Powers ' of Tho't and Motion, so the Father knows ' him.' The Meaning of which, I think, must be, That as we were made, or created, by Christ, and are therefore known by him, so Christ with all his Powers of Tho't, and Motion, was made, or created, by God; and that therefore God knows him by an immediate Intuition.

I can make no Sense of what Mr. H---t offers, unless this be the Meaning of what he says, namely, ' A like Reasoning would prove, ' that God not only knows our Thoughts but ' the Thoughts, of Christ too, by immediate ' Intuition:

‘ Intuition: Whereas this Argument doth not
 ‘ prove, that Christ knows the Father’s Tho’ts
 ‘ and Designs by Intuition.’ *i. e.* if I can make
 Sense of it, Christ doth not thus know the Fa-
 ther, because he did not make him; but the Fa-
 ther thus knows Christ, because he did make him.
 According to Mr. *H---* then, our Saviour’s
 Knowledge is no other than what a Creature,
 or made Being (for I know no Difference be-
 tween these) may have. That what he knows
 of the Thoughts and Designs of God is by
 Revelation; and that without such a Revela-
 tion, he would know nothing at all of these
 Tho’ts and Designs, and for Proof of what
 he says he offers *Mat. xxiv. 36. Mark xiii. 32.*
 This plainly enough shews, what a mean & dis-
 paraging Opinion Mr. *H---* must have of our
 blessed Saviour, to insinuate such Things con-
 cerning his Knowledge: But how shocking is
 it, in Philosophy and to Reason to be told
 in Effect, that the Creator of Men, and of all
 other Things, is but a Creature? And how
 grating must it be to a Christian’s Ears, to be
 told, that the great Saviour, and Judge of the
 World, that that glorious Person, whom all
 the Armies of Heaven and Inhabitants of
 Earth are obliged to worship, is a made Be-
 ing, and one that hath no other than a finite
 and limited Understanding!

But to consider more distinctly what Mr.
H--- says about the Knowledge of our Savi-
 our; and here, I confess, I can’t see what it
 could serve for but Amusement, or rather per-
 hap, to depreiate our Saviour’s Knowledge,
 to dwell so long upon what he tho’t, *p. 109.*
 ‘ might seem a Paradox to many, *viz.* that
 ‘ we can’t know that a particular Person thinks
 at

‘at all, unless we know what his particular thoughts are.’ For allowing, what he says about humane Knowledge to be true, (tho’ others perhaps, to use his own Expression, may think his four Pages upon this Paradox to be mere *Gibberish*) what can all this be to the Knowledge of the Son of God, unless he knew Things after the same Manner that we do? But ’tis plain, from Mr. H—t’s own Acknowledgment, that he doth not know Things as we do, by Sensation and Reflection, but as the great *Creator* of our thinking Faculties.

Mr. H—t, indeed, by saying that God made the World by Christ, seems to intimate, as if he thought our Saviour to be only an *instrumental Creator*, and not a proper efficient Cause: But as the Scriptures don’t direct to any such wild and unphilosophical Notion, so, I am apt to think, it would puzzle all Mr. H—t’s Philosophy, to tell us how it is so much as possible, that there should be any such Thing as *Instrumentality* in creating the Souls of Men with their thinking faculties, in creating *Thrones, Principalities, or Powers*, all which Things, together with all other Things, in *Heaven, and Earth, visible and invisible*, are said to be *created by him, and for him. Col. i. 16.* For is it not a proper Creation, *i. e.* a Production of something out of nothing, that the Apostle here speaks of? Were Principalities, Powers, and Dominions formed out of any pre-existing Materials? as they must be, if our Saviour was only an *instrumental Creator*.

Whatever may be said in other Cases, I think, ’tis too absurd to talk after this Rate, when we speak of the Creation of Angels, and the Souls of Men. These, I think, are *Beings*

Beings that can no otherwise be produc'd than by a pure Act of *Volition* and *Power*. The Cause that doth produce them must be a proper efficient Cause, a Cause that hath *creative Powers*; and whatever cause it be that hath *creative Powers* must, I think, have all the distinguishing Powers and Perfections of the Supreme God: Creation is ever represented in Scripture as peculiar to the Supreme God. * Nor can this be deny'd, unless we say, that the Apostle's Argument against Atheists and Unbelievers, *Rom. i. 20.* is inconclusive. The Apostle is most express here, *That the invisible Things of God, even his eternal Power and Godhead, are clearly seen by the Things that are made.* The World is but a finite Being, and yet evidently shews, that its Cause was Infinite, Almighty, and Eternal. And if there had been no such Cause, there had been no such Being as a World. What therefore can it signify, that Mr. H—t, and those of his Stamp, should be always harping, that God made all Things by Jesus Christ? There is no such Expression us'd in two of those Places that are quoted by Mr. H—t; nor yet in *Heb. i. 10.* where the Creation is undoubtedly spoken of. But if it was us'd in every Place of Scripture, where the Creation of Things is attributed to Jesus Christ, there could no Stress be laid upon it.

'Tis well known, that the Proposition *ἵνα*, with a Genitive Case after it, is us'd to express the Efficient Cause, as much as *ὑπο*, or *ἐκ*, *αὐτοῦ*. † Thus it is us'd, *Rom. xi. 36.* *I. Cor. vi. 14.* Where the Preposition *ἵνα* is apply'd

* See *Nehem. 9. 6.* *Isa. 40. 12, 13, &c. 18, 19, 20, 21.* *Isa. 42. 5, 8.* *Isa. 43. 1, 10.* *Jer. 10. 10, 11, 12.* *Psal. 102. 24, 25, 26, 27.* † Dr. *Waterland's* *Vindication*, *&c.* p. 185.

to the Person and Power of the Father, so that if, from the Force of the *Preposition*, it should be argu'd, that Christ is an *Instrumental Cause*, it must follow, that the Father is an *Instrumental Cause* also; and therefore, I think, that any Argument drawn from such a *Criticizm* is poor and trifling. Christ then is an efficient Cause, and a proper Creator; and as such, he hath all the Perfections that the Supreme God hath; and, among others, the same absolute Omniscience that the Father hath: So that he doth not know Things after a different Manner from what the Father doth, as Mr. H--t speaks. But if the Father knows Christ's Thoughts by *immediate Intuition*, Christ knows the Father's Thoughts by the *like Intuition*; and this is what our Saviour himself doth expressly assert concerning his Knowledge, *John x. 15. As the Father knoweth me, even so know I the Father.* But how could this be said by our Saviour with any Truth or Propriety, if the Father's Knowledge was unlimited, and his own limited; if the Father's was by Intuition, and his own by Revelation; if the Father's was Infinite and his own Finite? If these be the real Characters of the Son's Knowledge, he knew no more of the Father than any other created Being might have known; but this falls infinitely short of what our Saviour says.

But to satisfy the world, that what Mr. H--t says of the knowledge of the *Father* and *Christ* is perfectly groundless, and directly contrary to what the scriptures offer, I shall set down what the scripture says concerning the divine omniscience; whereby it will be evident that the same is ascrib'd to our blessed Saviour, and then shew how we are to understand these passages, *Mat. xxiv. 36. Mark xiii. 32.*

The passages in scripture that relate to the divine omniscience are, amongst others, these: *Jerem. xvii. 9, 10. The heart is deceitful above all Things, and desperately wicked, who can know it? I the Lord search the heart, I try the reins, even to give every man according to his ways, and according to the fruit of his doings. In Jerem. xi. 20. we have a passage to the same purpose: But, O Lord of Hosts, that judgest righteously, that tryest the reins and the heart; let me see thy vengeance on them, for unto thee have I open'd my cause. The like passage occurs, Jerem. xx. 12. But, O Lord of Hosts, that triest the righteous, and seeest the reins and the heart, &c. In all these passages, 'tis ascrib'd to God, as his great and peculiar prerogative, to search and see the hearts of men; & the question in the first passage doth evidently confine this knowledge to God himself; and this is what Solomon, under divine inspiration, had done before; I. Kings, viii. 39. Then hear thou in Heaven thy dwelling place, and forgive, and do to every man according to his ways, whose heart thou knowest (for thou, even thou only, knowest the hearts of all the children of men) God formed the Eye, as the scripture speaks, and therefore must see; he teacheth man knowledge, and therefore must know. He fills Heaven, and Earth, and therefore no man can hide himself in secret, so as that God should not see him.*

Again, God is not only represented as knowing our thoughts when they are form'd and brought forth; but as one that knows them afar off *Psa. 139. 2. Such knowledge as this is too excellent for any creature whatsoever, however exalted. 'Tis God only knows what thoughts are working, and what designs are forming, by this and the other particular Person,*

person, yea, by every individual person in the universe. 'Tis peculiar to God to know what hath been thought and done by the innumerable generations of men, that have been and shall be upon the face of the earth. The phrases of searching, seeing, and knowing the heart, are evidently the phrases that the scripture useth, to express the most perfect knowledge, that knowledge that's peculiar to the supreme and most perfect being. *The Lord seeth not as man seeth, for man looketh on the outward appearance, but the Lord looketh on the heart, 1. Sam. xvi. 7.* It can't be deny'd, that omniscience is one of the distinguishing characters of the supreme being, and the phrases that I have mention'd are those that the scripture useth to represent it.

The next enquiry then will be, whether the same, or phrases of the like import, are ascrib'd to our Saviour; for if they are, then it must evidently follow, that the scriptures make no difference between the knowledge of the Father and that of Christ, tho' Mr. H—t doth. The texts then that speak of the knowledge of Christ are these: *Revel. ii. 23. And all the Churches shall know, that I am he that searcheth the reins and the heart, and I will give to every one of you according to your works.* The phrase is exactly the same with that in *Jerem. xvii. 10.* Nor is there any warrant from Scripture to understand that in the prophet without restrictions and limitations, and that in the Revelations concerning our Saviour with them. The phrase is evidently the same; and what authority hath Mr. H—t, or any one else, to make the meaning different? Another scripture that speaks of the knowledge of Christ we have

have Acts i. 24, 25. *And they prayed, and said, Thou Lord, who knowest the hearts of men, shew whether of those two thou hast chosen, that he might take part of this ministry and apostleship.* Here what is confin'd by Solomon, in his Prayer, to the most high God, 1. Kings, 8. 29. is by the apostles, in their prayer to Jesus Christ, apply'd to him. Dr. Clark is forc'd to allow, * that 'tis most natural * to understand these words of Christ, because of Christ's chusing the rest of the Apostles. These words therefore, as they furnish us with a noble Precedent of the whole college of the Apostles addressing themselves by supplication to Christ, directly and ultimately, so they shew, that he hath an all-comprehensive knowledge. 'Tis evident from this passage, that Christ doth not only know this and the other particular person, but that he knows his heart. That he doth not only know the heart of this and the other particular person, but the hearts of all men. That he doth not only know the present bent and frame of all mens hearts, but he knows what they will be; and particularly which of those two, presented to him for his choice and approbation, would be fittest for service in his Church, during the whole time of his Apostleship. I can't find, that any thing higher is said of the knowledge of the supreme God in all the scripture. This evidently shews, that Christ doth not only know mens present, but their future, thoughts.

Farther, 'Tis said of Christ, John ii. 24, 25. *That he knows all men, and that he knows what*

* Post. of the Trinity, p. 132.

is in men, and that therefore he would not commit himself to those who profess'd to believe in him; because he knew them better than they did themselves; and that 'twas only a sudden, and not a sanctified, impression that was made upon them, and that therefore they could not be safely trusted. The like all-comprehensive knowledge we find ascrib'd to him, not only by Peter, *John xxi. 17.* but by the disciples in a body, *John xvi. 30.* Lord, says Peter, thou knowest all things, thou knowest that I love thee. Now we are sure, say the Disciples, that thou knowest all things. Here says, the learned Dr. Wotton, † 'we have a full and explicate confession made by the Disciples, and not in the least contradicted by Jesus Christ, of the omniscience of him whom they own'd to be the Son of God; who, since he had, during the whole course of his ministry, given glory to God the Father, would not, we may be sure, in this weighty particular, (when he had just before declared, that he would no longer speak to them in Proverbs) have left them in an error of that infinite importance, and entirely inconsistent with what they were then instructed to believe. To which he adds, by way of answer to the Texts (that I am soon to consider) that if he was omniscient at that time, he certainly was so a-day or two before, when he told them what signs should be of the destruction of *Jerusalem*, tho' he might not think it proper then to acquaint them with the precise day and hour when that terrible desolation should fall on the Jewish nation, polity, and temple.

These

† Dr. Wotton, of the omniscience of the Son of God. p. 15.

These passages of Scripture that I have mention'd make it abundantly evident, that *omniscience* is ascribed to our Saviour in all the fullest and strongest terms that 'tis to the supreme God. 'Tis the supreme God that *trieth the heart and reins*, Psa. vii. 9. 'Tis the supreme God that *is greater than our hearts, and knoweth all things*, I. John iii. 20. And yet no less than this is said of our blessed Saviour. This appears from the fore-quoted Texts; to which I might add what the Apostle says, Col. ii. 3. *That in him are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge. And that in him dwelt all the fulness of the Godhead bodily*, Col. ii. 9. Can any thing more lofty and magnificent, more pompous and divine, be said of the living and true God? If, therefore, our Saviour had only a *relative omniscience*, as some like to speak, and not that which is *absolute*, with what truth could it be said that in him dwelt all the fulness, &c.? Is not a proper and absolute omniscience a necessary branch of that fulness? And doth not every degree of ignorance denote imperfection, and argue such an emptiness as can't be consistent with the fulness of the Godhead?

But 'tis necessary, to support Mr. H---'s Scheme, that our Saviour should be defective and imperfect; and therefore, in defiance to the plainest scriptures, he must be represented as knowing things after another manner than the Father doth; and as being ignorant of somethings that the Father is well acquainted with. Tho' the Scriptures, when they speak of the knowledge of the supreme God, and the knowledge of Christ, do speak of both in the same terms. If St. Peter's notions and Mr. H---'s had been the same, he would never

have spoken as he doth, Lord thou knowest all things, thou knowest that I love thee. To say, that St. *Peter* spake in an *hyperbolical strain*, or that he was mistaken in what he said, is to say that which can never be justified. If there be any justifiable meaning in St. *Peter's* saying, it must, I think, be this; that he did really know all things; and that nothing knowable was hid from him, and what could this be, ' but a downright blasphemy, (as Dr. *Calamy* calls it) † in his Master's favour, to ascribe to him an infinite knowledge, which did belong to God alone, and not to him, ' if his knowledge was not of an equal extent with that of the Father?

But, what thoughts must Mr. *H—* have of our blessed Saviour, to imagine that he could have been pleased with this fulsome and blasphemous applause? If our Saviour had not known himself to be omniscient, he would have set *Peter* at rights, blam'd him for ascribing too much to him, and told him, as he did in another case, that he savour'd not of the things that are of God, but the things that are of men, who are apt to overstrain, as in *Herod's* case. The history in that case shews us, that God would not overlook the intolerable blasphemy; * and if there had been any thing of this in *Peter's* declaration concerning Christ's omniscience, our Saviour, we may believe, instead of charging *Peter* to feed his sheep and lambs, would rather have discharg'd him from his office, as one that was likely to have

C

taught

† Dr. *Calamy's* Doct. of the Trinity, p. 118. * *Acts*. 12. 23.

taught blasphemy and rebellion against the God of Heaven: At least he would have corrected his gross mistake, and not have laid such a stumbling - block in the way of all succeeding generations. But St. *Peter* ascrib'd no more to our Saviour after his resurrection than he himself, and the other disciples, had done before his death, without the least blame or intimation that they deserved any, for ascribing an absolute omniscience to him.

I would fain know then, what right Mr. *H—t*, or any person, hath to put restrictions and limitations upon the knowledge of Christ, when 'tis so plain that the Apostles did put none. The pretence, I know, here will be, what Mr. *H—t* suggests, in quoting *Mat. xxiv. 36. Mark xiii. 32*. These are the texts, or rather this one passage of scripture, (for 'tis but the same thing related with a very little variation by two Evangelists) is that in which the opposers of our Saviour's divinity are apt to triumph beyond all modesty, as if it was unanswerable: But if the fore-mention'd texts do abundantly establish the omniscience of our Saviour, as I must think they do, because deliver'd in the same high terms as any texts are that relate to God's omniscience, I should judge that, before any boast so much, they should endeavour to reconcile them to other passages of scripture that have no obscurity in them, and not make the several parts of scripture clash with one another, as they must if our Saviour, in a great many places, is expressly said to know all things, and is represented in this passage to be ignorant of some things.

Now to find out the true sense and meaning of [Scripture, I think this rule ought to be observ'd,

ferv'd, namely, that we interpret those Places that are difficult and obscure by those that are obvious and easy. To apply this rule then to the present case. We find it often said, that there is nothing hid from our blessed Saviour, that he knows all persons and things; that he knows the Father as the Father knows him; that he knows those things that are most difficult to be known, even the hearts and thoughts of men; that he knows those things that are most contingent, and that seem to be every way as remote and distant from the knowledge of any inferior being, as the precise day of the destruction of *Jerusalem*, or the day of judgment; and particularly, that he knew the signs that would immediately precede the destruction of *Jerusalem*; and that it would be full time for those that would be safe to hasten out of *Jerusalem*, that they might avoid the destruction that was just at hand. Now, 'tis well known, that most of those things that I have mention'd, and do concern the knowledge of our Saviour, are spoken of so frequently, upon so many occasions, and in such a variety of expressions, that it seems to be a plain wresting of scripture, if we don't understand them according to the common sense and signification of the Words. When therefore it is so frequently and expressly asserted, that Christ knows all things, and when besides it is so necessary, that Christ should know all things, that he may be able to govern his Church and the world, that he may be able to hear the prayers, and answer the various occasions, of all his disciples, in all parts of the creation, and that he may be able at last to render to all according to their works, how ought we, in

reason, and according to true *criticism*, to interpret a single passage, whose signification is obscure, and will plainly admit of many plausible interpretations? And how should we interpret a passage of the like obscurity, if we met with it in a heathen author? Why, according to Mr. H—'s suggestion, we ought to interpret a great many plain and express passages, and such as (without straining) will bear no other interpretation, by one that is obscure, and whose sense is doubtful, and not this one that is obscure and doubtful, by many that are plain. But I appeal to the world, whether this be not contrary to all the rules of interpretation and good sense; and whether ever such a method of interpretation be us'd, unless it be found necessary to serve and support an Hypothesis that must sink and fall without it.

I think, the fair and reasonable way is, to interpret one doubtful passage by many that are plain; not to argue from such a passage, that one thing seems to be hid from our blessed Saviour, and that therefore he hath not an infinite knowledge but to argue, from the whole tenour of scripture, that he hath such an infinite knowledge; and that therefore this passage ought to be so understood, as that it may be consistent with a great many other scriptures, in which this great and important truth of Christ's absolute omniscience is establish'd.

There have a great many ways been tho't of to make this passage accord with other scriptures. There are some that have thought, that these things are only spoken *primarily* of the Father, and that they do no otherwise exclude the Son than as he was not *Fons Trinitatis*. This seems to be the sense of *Irenaeus* and

and *Basil*. They both own and plead for the omniscience of the Son, and that he did communicate both in nature and perfections with the Father; but then, as they thought, according to what was establish'd after *Irenaeus's* time, in the council of *Nice*, that Christ was God of God, Light of Light, very God, or true God, of true God, begotten, not made, being of one substance with the Father, by whom all things were made, so they held, that there was a Priority of order, tho' not of nature, and that accordingly the Son, tho' he did know all things, yet he did not know them *primarily*.

Others, to solve this difficulty, have tho't, particularly the late Dr. *Bennet*, that during our Saviour's ministry, his divine nature was *quiescent*, and that accordingly he might know a great many things as God, that he might not know as man. This last is most true; but as to the quiescency of the divine nature of Christ, I take it to be an opinion that can't be justified, and that is in a great many respects contrary to the sacred scriptures.

Another method that hath been taken (particularly by Dr. *Wotton*,) † to answer the difficulty, hath been, to give the words this interpretation, *viz.* That the Son did know the precise day & hour when *Jerusalem* should be destroy'd, and the world judged; but that he was not willing to make that day and hour known; and that the disciples probably understood thereby, what our Saviour design'd they should, namely, That that was not the proper season for that secret to be reveal'd. He
sup-

† Omniscience of the Son of God, p. 6, 7, &c.

supposeth, that what our Saviour deliver'd upon this Occasion was according to the *Hebrew* or *Syriack Phraseology*, which, he says, will bear this meaning; that none maketh, or will make, known the day and hour; that the *Son* intended not then to make that day and hour known: But that the *Father* would in his proper time reveal it; that it was sufficient for them to know what he had told them concerning this matter, and that their *Curiosity* ought to lead them no farther.

I must confess, the learned Doctor offers several plausible things to justify this interpretation, and proves, I think, irrefragably, * that our Saviour could not possibly be ignorant of the precise day and hour when these great events should happen, any more than he could of those many particular signs which he foretold, as the signs which were to usher in these *astonishing events*. He says, I think enough to silence all the opposers of our Saviour's omniscience; but after all, I think the old solution of this difficulty is very rational and perfectly agreeable to scripture.

To understand this passage then, we are to consider, that our Saviour is spoken of in scripture, as having *two distinct Natures*. He was *God manifest in the Flesh*, I. Tim. iii. 16. or, as the same Apostle doth express it in another Place, he was of the *seed of David according to the Flesh*; but in his other or highest nature, *God over all blessed for evermore*, Rom. ix. 5. As therefore Christ had two different Natures, so in different

re-

* Dr. Wotton of the Omniscience of the Son of God, p. 16, 17, 18, 19, &c.

respects he might have a *limited* and an *unlimited understanding*, a limited one as Man, and an unlimited and all-comprehensive one as God. he might be ignorant of some things, and yet know all things. This can't be thought to be any thing like begging the question ; for 'tis plain, that the Scriptures often speak of Christ under these two different capacities, that they speak of him, as having the perfections of God, and as having the nature and innocent infirmities of man.

When the scriptures speak of him in his highest nature and capacity, they speak of him as the *brightness of his Father's glory, and the express image of his person, as one by whom all things consist*, Col. i 17. They speak of him as one, *that upholdeth all things by the word of his power, and knows all things by the infinity of his understanding ; as one whom all the angels of God are oblig'd to worship ; as one whose throne is for ever and ever ; as one that is equal with God, and one with him.* But then, when the scriptures speak of him as man, they speak of him as *increasing in wisdom and stature ; as one that took our infirmities, and bore our sicknesses ; as one that was subject to hunger and thirst, to weariness and fainting, to sorrow and death, &c.*

If therefore we consider him as to his highest nature, so the day of judgment and the destruction of *Jerusalem* were not secrets to him, any more than the signs that were immediately to precede them: In this respect there was nothing a secret to him, whether past, present, or to come. If it was, the scriptures would never speak of his knowledge as all-comprehensive, as we find they frequently do. It can't therefore be to this nature of his that
our

our Saviour doth refer, when he saith, that the Son doth not know when the events that he speaks of shall come to pass. He can by no means exclude his entire self, when he says, that the Father only knows this. But 'tis no derogation at all to our Saviour, consider'd as man that he should be ignorant of this.

Considering our Saviour as man, there must be many things that he may not know, and many things that he can't do. Consider'd as man, the *Father is infinitely greater than he*. Consider'd as such, *he can do nothing of himself*. He may be sent by the Father; he may be in the *form of a servant*; he may need an angel to strengthen him when in his last agony; he may be a *man of sorrow and acquainted with grief*; he may be the greatest of sufferers, and fall a sacrifice for sin. And most certain it is, that the scriptures do always refer to his humanity, when they speak of him as subject to any imperfection. As such, he may receive commands and authority from the Father. As such, he may be inform'd as to many things which he could not otherwise be acquainted with. Our Saviour, as man, had a great many things communicated to him; and as such, he must be unacquainted with several things that were not thus made known unto him. Of this kind was the precise time of the destruction of *Jerusalem*, and the day of judgment. In that high capacity in which Christ is said to know all things, he knew this: But as the son of man (tho' superiour to angels in knowledge and dignity) he did not. And this might be sufficient to check the farther *curiosity* of his disciples about this matter, when he the most highly

highly favour'd person in the creation was kept in the dark as to this affair.

This account of the different natures and understandings of Christ, and the respective knowledge of both, is not coin'd by *divines* to get over a difficulty, but is evidently founded on the scriptures themselves; and particularly we may take Notice of this distinction, *John* iv. 6, 29. For consider'd as man, it is here said of our Saviour, *that being wearied with his Journey he set down on the well*; but consider'd in his higher capacity, it is here also said of him, *that he told the woman of Samaria all that ever she did*. 'Tis far therefore from being absurd to say, that in one sense Christ did know, and that in another he did not know, when the day and hour that he speaks of would be.

Many of the *ancients* thought, that this was a solid and sufficient answer to the objection made against our Saviour's omniscience, as *Chrysostom, Hilary, Athanasius*; yea, some among the *moderns*, who in some things have been thought to speak somewhat too favourably on the objectors side, do yet own, that no argument can be drawn from these Passages to prove the limited nature of our Saviour's knowledge. I'll mention one, and he a great master of clear reasoning, who speaks thus: * 'Some, *says he*, and those of no small account, have understood these Words, as if our Saviour only intended to put off his disciples from a particular enquiry about this matter; not that he was ignorant of the day of judgment, but

D

that

* A. Bp. Tillotson's *Posthumous Works* Octavo, Vol. 6th, p. 272. 3. 4.

e that he did not know it so as to reveal it to
 e them. But this, *says he*, is by no means to
 e be admitted, because it looks too like the
 e equivocation of the Jesuites. Others, *says he*,
 e say, that the humane nature was not igno-
 e rant of the day of judgment; but that it
 e did not know this of itself, but by virtue
 e of its union with the divine nature: But
 e our Saviour, *says he*, says absolutely, that the
 e Son did not know it, and therefore others
 e have more reasonably distinguish'd between
 e his humane nature and divine; and tho' as
 e God he could not be ignorant of any thing,
 e yet his humane understanding did not know
 e it. And 'tis not unreasonable to suppose, that
 e the divine wisdom, which dwelt in our Sa-
 e viour, did communicate itself to his humane
 e soul, according to his pleasure, and so his
 e humane nature might at sometimes not know
 e some things. And if this be not admitted,
 e *says he*, how can we understand that passage
 e concerning our Saviour, *Luke ii. 52.* that
 e *Jesus grew in wisdom and stature?* For if the hu-
 e mane nature of Christ did necessarily know
 e all things by virtue of its union with the
 e divinity, he could not then, as man, be said
 e to grow in wisdom; and this, *says he*, I think
 e may be sufficient for the clearing of this dif-
 e ficulty concerning the Son's not knowing
 e the particular time which God had appoin-
 e ted for judging the world.

To this of this great man I might add a
 great deal more to the same purpose from o-
 thers; particularly from *Dr. Calamy*, * who ad-
 mirably

* *Doctr. of the Trinity. p. 119. 120. &c.*

mirably answers the objections made by *Crel-
lins* and *Mr. Emlyn* from this passage of scrip-
ture, as also from *Dr. Whisby*, † who hath most
of these excellent words, as he calls them, that
follow from *Dr. Lightfoot*: * ‘ It is one thing,
‘ *says he*, to understand the *Son* of God barely
‘ & abstractly for the second person in the Holy
‘ Trinity, and another to understand him for
‘ the *Messias*, or that second Person incarnate.
‘ To say the second person in the trinity knows
‘ not something is blasphemous; to say so of
‘ the *Messias* is not so, who nevertheless was
‘ the same with the second person in the Tri-
‘ nity. For altho’ the second person abstractly
‘ consider’d, according to his mere deity, was
‘ co-equal with the Father, co-omnipotent,
‘ co-omniscient, co-eternal with him, &c. yet
‘ the *Messias*, who was God-man, consider’d
‘ as *Messias*; was a servant and messenger of
‘ the Father, and received commands and au-
‘ thority from the Father. And those expres-
‘ sions, the *Son* can do nothing of himself, &c.
‘ will not in the least serve the *Arians* turn, if
‘ you take them in this sense, as you must ne-
‘ cessarily do. *Messias* can do nothing of him-
‘ self, because he is a servant and a deputy.
‘ But we must distinguish between the excel-
‘ lencies and perfections of Christ, which flow-
‘ ed from the *hypostatical union* of the two na-
‘ tures, and those which flowed from the *Do-
‘ nation* and *anointing* of the holy spirit. From
‘ the *hypostatical union* of the natures flow’d
‘ the infinite dignity of his person, his impec-
‘ cability, his infinite self-sufficiency to perform

D 2

‘ the

† Annot. on *Mark* 13. 32. * *Dr. Lightfoot's Works*,
Vol. 2. p. 351.

' the law, and to satisfy the divine justice.
 ' From the anointing of the spirit flow'd his
 ' power of miracles, his fore-knowledge of
 ' things to come, and all kind of knowledge
 ' of evangelical mysteries. These render'd him
 ' a fit and perfect redeemer; these a fit and
 ' perfect minister of the gospel. So that those
 ' things which were revealed by Christ to his
 ' church, he had them from the revelation of
 ' the spirit, not from that union. Nor is it
 ' any derogation or detraction from the digni-
 ' ty of his person, that he saith, *he knew not*
 ' *the day and hour, &c.* yea it excellently agrees
 ' with his office and deputation, who being
 ' the *Father's* servant, messenger, and minister,
 ' followed the orders of the *Father*, and o-
 ' bey'd him in all things.'

We may observe from this passage, that Dr.
Lightfoot answers the objection a little differ-
 rently from A-Bp. *Tillotson* and others; but it
 comes much to the same. And whereas it is
 said by some, that the words are express'd
 without any *limitation*, I answer, that this is
 often done in scripture, where yet a *limitation*
 must necessarily be understood; thus in that
 saying of our Saviour to the *Canaanitish* or *Syro-*
phenian woman, *Mat. xv. 24. I am not, says*
Christ here, sent but to the lost sheep of the house of
Israel. 'Tis certain, that Christ was sent to *seek*
and save all that were lost, and also that *he tast-*
ed death for every man; And therefore our Sa-
 viour's saying is to be understood thus, that
 he was first promised, and first came to them,
 and was first preach'd unto them. * Our Sa-
 viour's

* *John* 1. 11. *Acts* 3. 26. *Acts* 13. 46.

viour's answer to this Woman can't without blasphemy be said to favour of *equivocation*, or to open a way to falshood: Nor did our Saviour go one step beyond his commission in curing the woman's daughter; and yet says he, I am not sent but to the lost sheep of the house of *Israel*. There's plainly a *limitation* in these words tho' not express'd.

We have another passage to the same purpose, where a *limitation* must be understood, tho' not express'd, *John xvii. 11.* Here Christ says, *that he was no more in the world*: And yet, to encourage his disciples, he tells them, *Mat. xxviii. 20. That he would be with them always even to the end of the world*: And so also, *Mat. xviii. 20.* he tells them, *that where two or three are gather'd together in his name, there he would be in the midst of them*. When therefore Christ says, *that he was no more in the world*, his meaning must be, *that they would no more have his bodily presence*: But 'twas never his intention to deny his *divine omnipresence*, or that they should never have any support or benefit thereby. This is what he promis'd in the places I have mention'd; nor do these seemingly opposite passages at all clash with one another. The one refers to his humane bodily presence, and the others to his divine omnipresence. There is evidently therefore a *tacit limitation* in these words also, *Now I am no more in the World*, tho' the *limitation* be not expressed here neither. In like manner there may, and must be, the same *limitation* in that passage I have been considering; for that otherwise it can't, I think, be reconcil'd to a great many plain and express passages of scripture concerning the unlimited knowledge of our blessed saviour.

Nor

Nor doth the exclusive term *only* in *St. Matthew* forbid such a limitation; for if this was true, that this word only must exclude all other persons, it would prove too much, namely, that the Father himself cannot be God. It can't, I think, with any just reason be deny'd; that these two passages, *Jude* iv. 25. do both belong to our blessed Saviour, where he is expressly call'd *the only Lord God*, and *the only wise God*. *St. Jude*, 'tis plain, borrow'd the first passage, as he doth many others in his epistle, from the 2d. Epistle of *St. Peter*, chap. ii. 1. where *St. Peter* speaks of some *who deny'd the Lord that bought them*, which must be understood of Jesus Christ, who purchased or *redeem'd us by his own blood*: † Nor is there any thing in what some have said, that the word *ἀποστρέφειν* is never ascrib'd to Christ; for 'tis plain, that Christ ascribes it to himself. If they have call'd the master of the house Belzebub, how much more they of the household? The original word is *ἀποστρέφειν*, *Mat.* x. 25. and Christ is evidently the Person meant thereby; and so he is also in that other passage, *II. Tim.* ii 21. where the same word is us'd.

'Twas Christ therefore that the *Hereticks St. Peter* speaks of deny'd; and therefore, seeing they are the very same persons that *St. Jude* speaks of, the passage in *Jude* would have been more conveniently translated, if instead of being render'd, *denying the only Lord God, and our Lord Jesus Christ*, it had been render'd thus, *denying the Lord Jesus Christ, our only master, God, and Lord*; or thus, *denying the only Lord*

† *I. Pet.* 1. 18. *I. Cor.* 6. 20. *Acts.* 20. 28.

Lord God, *even* our Lord Jesus. The particle *καί* which I translate *even*, tho' it be sometimes a note of *distinction*, yet it is very often a note of *explication*, and translated *even*, as I have done by our own *translators*. Thus they translate it, * and if they had thus translated *καί* in this 4th of *Jude*, the passage had been perspicuous and full; for it is plain, that it refers to our blessed Saviour, and so also doth that, ver. 25. For the *Doxology* here doth most evidently relate to the person spoken of in the preceding verse, which must be our Saviour, who in *Ephes.* v. 26. 27. is spoken of as *sanctifying his church, and presenting it to himself a glorious church, not having spot, or wrinkle, or any such thing, but that it be holy, and without blemish*, or, as it is here in *Jude*, *faultless before the presence of his glory*; i. e. when he appears at last in power and great glory, to render to all according to their Works.

Our Saviour then, in this epistle of *Jude*, is spoken of as *the only Lord God, and the only wise God*; but yet the apostle could have no design of excluding the *Father*; so that no argument can be drawn from the *exclusive particles, only and but*, in these texts of *Mat.* and *Mark*, that I have been considering, to exclude our Saviour and the Holy Ghost, any more than there can from those in *St. Jude*, to exclude the Father and the Holy Ghost, or any more than there can from the terms *θεός* and *εἰ μὴ*, which are apply'd to the Holy Ghost, *I. Cor.* ii. 11. to exclude the Father and the Son. 'Twould be as odd to say, that the Son doth not

* *Rom.* I. *Cor.* 15. 24. *I. Thes.* 3. 13.

not know himself, because 'tis said, that *no one knoweth the Son but the Father*, as 'twould be to say, that the Father doth not know himself, because 'tis said in the same place, *that no one knoweth the Father but the Son*, Mat. xi 27. Tho' nothing therefore can be concluded from the *exclusive particles*, which are sometimes apply'd in scripture to the Father, sometimes to the Son, and sometimes to the Holy Ghost; yet so much is said in scripture of our Saviour's omniscience, that we can't but conclude from thence, that he could not be ignorant of any thing in his highest capacity. But then our Saviour, as man, could not know the precise time of the destruction of *Jerusalem*, or the day of judgment, 'till these things were revealed to him. And tho' as God he did know these things, yet he did not think fit to reveal them; because, as a minister and a prophet, these things were not delivered in charge to him, that he might reveal them. And he himself is pleas'd to give a very good reason why it was not proper to reveal them, namely, that his disciples might always give themselves to *watchfulness* and *prayer*, as persons that knew not when these things should come to pass.

And tho', for such an important reason, it was very necessary, that the disciples of Christ should be kept in the dark, as to the precise time when such events should take place; yet how unreasonable is it to suppose, (if the scriptures had not said so much concerning our Saviour's omniscience) that our Lord himself, who here represents himself as a master that was going abroad, should not know the time when he intended to return, and fulfil these great events that he here refers to? What can

can be clearer than that our Saviour must know this, as well as who those servants of his were that should act faithfully, and who not, during his absence. If Christ was not ignorant of the one, 'tis as clear as any thing need be, that he could not be ignorant of the other.

And thus, by what I have said, I would hope, I have sufficiently obviated all the objections of *Crellius*, *Mr. Emlyn*, and others, upon this head, from which the grand objection hath been taken against our Saviour's Divinity, and I have been much the larger upon this discourse of *Mr. H—t's*, that christians might receive no prejudice by what hath been so largely and boldly said by those writers I have mention'd, and more covertly by *Mr. H—t*, who seems to be entirely with them, if he would have been so honest as to speak plainly, as those Writers have been: But 'tis too much *Mr. H—t's* way to be bold enough in some cases, and to deliver his sentiments in other matters under disguised colours, and only to give some darker hints, where more plain speaking would be more shocking, and perhaps open some peoples eyes, that he may think advisable should be kept in the dark: But how honest and becoming this is, I must leave to the judgment of the world.

Mr. H—t's 7th discourse examin'd, and the Doxology at the end of the Lord's-prayer in St. Mat. prov'd to be a part of sacred scripture.

IN this discourse, *Mr. H—t* is pleased to oppose the revd. and learned *Mr. Jer. Jones*,
E
who

who had determin'd, † that the *Doxology* at the end of the *Lord's-prayer* was as old as the prayer itself. My business in examining this discourse shall not be so much to vindicate Mr. Jones and these several reasons that he gives for this his opinion, as to enquire, whether Mr. H—t had reason to say, as p. 150, ' That the doxology that we have, *Mat.* vi. 13. was added to the Prayer, not by our Lord, or by St. *Mat.* but from later authors, and the liturgies of the Church.' This last, I own, Mr. H—t speaks after *Dupin*, *Huntly*, *Maldonate*, *Bellarmin*, and other writers of the *Romish* Church, with whom agree, *Grotius* and the great and very learned Dr. *Mill*, and if Dr. *Mill*, had been the only person that had said it, Mr. H—t, who borrows from him most of that pomp of learning, in which he seems so fond to appear, would hardly have ventur'd to contradict him: But methinks, unless he had some of the best reasons, as well as the authority of Dr. *Mill*, to support him, he should never have join'd issue in opposing this passage, with the *Papists*, who are ever throwing this in our Teeth, that our Scriptures are interpolated, and that therefore we can't depend upon them as a *rule of faith and manners*.

As to the controverted passage itself, Mr. H—t owns, p. 151. ' that it is perfectly agreeable to the doctrines and rules of the gospel, and is to be found in so many words in the Bible, and that we need not stick to make use of it at the end of this, or any Prayer.' To what purpose then, should he attempt to fill

† Jones's new method of settling the Canon of Script.
Vol. 1st. p. 140. &c.

fill honest and weak christians heads with scruples about the genuineness of any part of scripture? Why should he or any other puzzle them with their *fancies*, that in one place of scripture we have too much, and in another, too little? And why should any thus furnish *Papists* with weapons against the *reformation*? And especially, when there are such reasons on the other side as may be sufficient to determine wise and learned men to think as the rest of their fellow christians do. There may be something of a reason given why the *papists*, who stick at nothing to serve their cause, should so generally oppose this passage of scripture. 'Tis a principle with them to run down the *perfection* of the sacred scriptures, that they may the better make way for their oral traditions. 'Tis no wonder therefore that such endeavour to find faults, when there are really none: But what Mr. H—t's aim should be mayn't be so easy to tell.

I can think but of two reasons that should be of weight with Mr. H—t in this case. One may be to shew his *learning*, of which he seems to be extremely willing that the world should think he hath a large stock. But allowing it to be as large as he would have it thought, there are many more useful ways of employing it, than to put persons out of conceit with any part of their *bibles*, especially at a time when so many are attempting to put them out of conceit with the whole. Another reason may be, that he had a fair opportunity given him by Mr. *Jones*, to bring in the story out of *Lucian's Philopatri*, who ridicules the doctrine of the *Trinity*. I cannot forbear thinking, that this might have a great hand in determining

him to write as he doth in this chapter. Would he else have spent three pages in giving such a particular account of what is said by such a *prophane and atheistical author*, (be he *Lucian* or who he will) as was the author of this dialogue?

If Mr. H—t thinks he hath reason to deny the doctrine of the ever blessed Trinity, he might, methinks, in *good manners*, have forbore to manifest so much of a seeming pleasure in the *prophane banter and sneers* of this scandalous heathen author, and to tell us, 'that in a doxology offered to the Trinity, there might be something that this ludicrous writer would account and call *famous*.' That is, in plain english *infamous*. Mr. H—t is so far from shewing the least dislike to the impious *drollery* of this prophane Heathen, that he seems wonderfully glad of the opportunity of setting it before the world as a *specimen* of his wit and good sense, that he should ridicule a doxology in which glory is ascrib'd to *Father, Son, and Spirit* together. A heathen says he, p. 146. 'would naturally speak of such a doxology, as being famous upon the account of its containing something new and surprizing.' The plain sense of which is, that this ludicrous heathen had reason sufficient to insult and scoff at such a doxology, in which glory was ascribed to three in one, and one in three; or to *Father, Son, and Holy-Ghost*, as three persons, and one God: For, as he says, 'the doxology in *Mat.* is a plain rational doxology, in which is nothing particular or uncommon; nothing that a heathen could ridicule, p. 145. nothing but a downright atheist can say to God.' And doth not all this plainly import, that in Mr.
H—t's

H—t's judgment, this heathen had sufficient reason to ridicule that common doxology, that christians did then and do still use.

But I would fain know of *Mr. H—t*, whether (according to the pattern of his admir'd and applauded heathen) he hath not the same reason to banter that form of *baptism* which we have *Mat. xxviii. 19.* or that form of *benediction*, (as 'tis commonly call'd,) but more properly *prayer*, that we have, *II. Cor. xiii. 14.* as his merry heathen had to banter the common doxology of christians, perfectly agreeable to the sense of scripture, tho' not found there in so many words? For is not baptism a dedication to the service of God? And do not persons stipulate therein, to serve, worship, and honour God? And are not the *Father*, *Son*, and *Holy-Ghost*, represented in this form of baptism, as that God to whom we are devoted, and whom we oblige ourselves to serve and worship? Now, if this be true, what reason could *Mr. H—t* have to applaud a saucy impudent heathen, for making a jest of christians, and their worship, for ascribing kingdom, power, and glory, to Father, Son, and Holy-Ghost, in whose name, as the one living and true God, they had been baptiz'd?

Farther, is it not as justifiable to praise *Father*, *Son*, and *Holy Ghost*, as christians do in their doxology, as to pray unto them, as they are warranted to do, *II. Cor. xiii. 14*? *Mr. H—t* therefore should leave these Texts also out of his *Bible* as well as the doxology in *Mat.* before he had ventured to applaud, and make himself and his admirers merry with, the prophane and blasphemous jests of a *bantering Heathen*. *Mr. H—t* can't be ignorant that we are expressly directed, to give glory to him that sits up-

on the Throne, and to the Lamb for ever and ever, as the co-partner thereof: And why should it be more ridiculous to give glory to three, than two? Why should it be absurd to call these three one, when the scriptures call them so? And why should any christian that hath not renounced his baptism, make any difficulty of this, when by his baptism he is obliged thus to worship and glorify God; and when he is also sure, that the Spirit is that *God that worketh in him both to will and to do of his own good pleasure*. For my own part, I must confess, that if I had been in Mr. H—t's sentiments, I should have trembled to say any thing that might look like applauding a scandalous, scornful, scoffing heathen, as Mr. H—t hath done, particularly in a case that concerns the *great and unsearchable God*, and wherein I knew I differ'd (to a very trifle) with the whole christian world. The *religion*, and *modesty* of such a conduct are much alike. But dismissing this, I come more closely to enquire, whether Mr. H—t had reason to say, that the doxology *Mat. vi. 13.* ' was added to the prayer, ' not by our Lord, or St. *Matthew*, but from ' later authors, and the liturgies of the Church, p. 150. 151.' And here, the better to establish this groundless opinion, Mr. H—t, p. 134. finds fault with Mr. *Jones*, for saying that it is found in the best, most ancient, and almost all the *Greek* manuscripts in the world. This, he says, ' is not express'd with that accuracy as ' truth requires.' But then, he should have given some better reason for it than he doth; for Mr. *Jones* says no more than such great Men as *Glossin*, * *Winfins*, † do. Nay, *Erasmus* and

* *Gloss.* Philol. sacra, p. 149. † *Winf.* exercit. in oration. Domin. p. 236.

and *Bellarmino* themselves acknowledge the same that *Mr. Jones* asserts, tho' out of honour to their church, and the *Latin version* of the new Testament, they oppose the passage. This testimony of those two learned Papists is the more to be regarded, because it comes from those that were not only adversaries, but vehement adversaries thereto; to give the greater weight to what he says, *Mr. Jones* adds the testimony of *Lucas Brugensis*, which *Mr. H—t* takes no notice of; but 'tis no wonder, when *Brugensis* says, * that the doxology was extant in all the copies of the New Testament at *Paris* excepting one, which he thinks was corrected by the *Latin copy*. The copies, he says, were sixteen in all, most of them manuscripts: When therefore there was not one of these Books that had the prayer in it, but had the doxology, except one that was corrected (as he conjectures) by the *Latin*, this methinks should determine the matter; especially, if it be considered, that this *Brugensis*, as *Dr. Mill* says, † was *diligentissimus exemplarium investigator*, and did every thing exactly with the utmost accuracy, and according to truth.

But, in opposition to what *Mr. Jones* says, *Mr. H—t* says, there are two copies, viz. the *Cambridge* and *Vatican*, that have not the doxology, which he would have thought to be the best and most most ancient, p. 134. But to insinuate this, as to the *Cambridge copy*, is either a notorious blunder, or such a shameful imposition upon the unlearned reader, as every wise

* In *Notis ad var. Lect. Edit. Græc. Tom. Sex. Bibl. Polyglota* 146. p. 1. † *Mill. Prolegom. Edit. Kuster. p. 137. 138.*

wise and good man should be ashamed of, I allow, that this copy seems to be ancient; but to suggest, as if it was among the best, is highly unbecoming an honest man, and a *sincere inquirer* after truth, when it is so stigmatiz'd by *Beza* himself, who gave it to the university, as to be thought rather fit to be kept, than publish'd, because it differ'd so much from truth, and other copies. † And as to Mr. *H—t*, he should, one would think, have been the last man that should have suggested this, when he has forc'd to own, after Dr. *Mill*, (whom in most things he follows with a most *implicit faith*) that it is a very corrupt copy, p. 135.

Mr. *H—t* indeed is pleased to say, however, 'that its testimony in favour of an addition can't be of great weight, whereas its testimony against an addition can't but be considerable, p. 135.' But 'tis so far, I think, from being considerable, that the *Cambridge copy* hath not the doxology, that it deserves no regard: because it not only abounds with interpolations, but leaves out a vast number of things besides the doxology. * Dr. *Towerson* says very justly of it, †† that no man of sense will lay any stress upon it, where it shall be found to differ from almost all other copies, as it is plain it doth in the present case. And least of all should there be any stress laid upon it in the case under consideration, when it is certain, as Dr. *Mill* says, * that the copy was made by a

Latin

† Epist. *Beza* ad acad. *Cant.* præmiss. Lect. var. *Græc.* Nov. Test. Tom. Sexto Bibl. Polyglor. * Var. Lec. Tom. Sexto Bib. Pol. versus finem. †† Append. to his expos. of the Lord's prayer, Vol. 2d. Part 3d. p. 158. * Proleg. p. 132.

Latin scribe, who very probably thought, that the doxology was an *interpolation*, and therefore ought to be left out. The *Cambridge copy* then, I must think, will do no service to Mr. H—t's cause.

Nor will the *Vatican copy* help him much in this matter neither; for if this was not the copy that was first at *Paris*, and afterwards sent to the *Vatican Library*, and corrected, (*as Lucas Brugensis* often says) by the *Latin copies*; yet as Dr. *Mill* observes from *Father Simon's* critical history, it was writ by a *Latin scribe*, and made to agree with the *Italick version*. * And therefore, says Dr. *Mill*, I presently laid it aside, as a book made from the *Latin copy*, or at least corrected by it, & therefore not worthy to be regarded for its various readings. I leave the world therefore to judge, what regard is to be paid to Mr. H—t, when he represents the *Cambridge*, and *Vatican*, as some of the oldest and best copies, and that their testimony against the doxology is not contemptible, whereas it is most probable that the doxology was expung'd out of both by the *Latin scribes* that had the handling of them, that they might be conformable to the *Latin version*: If therefore Mr. H—t hath said what he hath about these copies ignorantly, he is to be pity'd that he knows no better: But I rather think he hath suppress'd the *truth*, to serve a *turn*, and I shall leave the world to call that by what name they think fit. I can't think but what Mr. *Jones* says is most true; that the doxology is certainly in the best, most ancient,

F

and

and almost all the *Greek manuscripts* in the world.

Mr. H---t finds fault with Mr. Jones, p. 136. for saying, that *Chrysostom* and others of the *Greek Fathers* read the passage, and concealing it from his readers at the same time; that the older *Greek Fathers* repeat the Lord's-prayer without the doxology; & then mentions *Origen*, *Gregory Nyssen*, and *Cyril of Jerusalem*, as those older fathers; reflecting on Mr. Jones as cautious not to say the best and most antient of the *Greek Fathers*. Mr. H---t, I presume, won't venture to say, tho' he suggests it, that *Origen*, tho' ancient, was one of the best *Greek Fathers*. 'Tis, I am sure, but a very indifferent character that his admir'd Dr. *Mill* gives of him, and such as shews, that there is but little regard to be had to what he says; for, according to him, he sometimes us'd one reading, and sometimes another, and often puts a different reading upon the same place. * What copy he us'd when he writ his *commentaries* upon the Lord's-prayer Mr. H---t doth not say. If it was the gospel of the *Nazarens*, which Mr. *Toland*, so highly commends, and which *Origen*, according to *Jerom* and Mr. *Toland*, often us'd, 'tis no wonder, that he takes no notice of the doxology. But then this gospel, according to Dr. *Mill*, contains several erroneous and heterodox things in it. It also contains in it, according to others, not only a great many foolish and ridiculous things, but things so abominably bad as can never be excus'd, particularly that Christ was a sinner, that he was unwilling to be baptiz'd &c. 'Twill therefore be no credit to Mr. H---t's opinion to mention *Origen*, if this

* *Millii Prolego.* p. 65.

this be the copy that he us'd when he writ his commentaries: 'Tis, in short, a scandalous copy, and such as doth greatly abuse St. *Mathew* and the world.

Farther, Mr. *H*——t doth not say, whether he had what he says of *Origen* out of his homilies, as written in *Greek*, or out of the *Latin translation* that was made of his commentaries. If out of the latter, it can't be wonder'd at that he should speak as he does, because there is no room to question but this translation, which is so full of other faults, was made by the translator to harmonize with the *Latin version* of the New Testament; but whether it be taken from *Origen's Greek* or *Latin commentaries*, or whether *Origen* himself us'd the *Nazaren* or another copy, it signifies too little to be nicely enquir'd into, seeing he doth not only, according to Dr. *Whitby*, † find fault with the prayer itself, as deliver'd by St. *Luke*, but 'twas very common with him to make too bold with the scriptures in other instances, and to leave in, or put out, what seem'd most agreeable to his vast but irregular wit, as the Bishop of St. *David's* in his answer to *Woolston*, very justly calls it.

As to *Chrysostom*, who hath the *doxology*, Dr. *Mill* on *Mat.* vi. 13. * owns, that he undoubtedly made use of the copies then extant. Now, these copies must be of as great, or rather greater antiquity than the famous *Alexandrian* itself, which is suppos'd by the great Dr. *Grabe*, and other learned men, to have been made about the year 396 or 398, very near
F 2 the

† Dr. *Whitby's* examen *Millii*, p. 29. * *Millii* Novum Testamentum.

the time that *Chrysostom* flourish'd. Nay, *Chrysostom* did not only explain the doxology, which he found in all the *Greek copies* then extant, but in his 20th homily on the 6th of *Matthew* † endeavours to shew the reason of Christ's adding this doxology, viz. that his Disciples might take encouragement from it, not to be afraid of the evil one, or any evil whatsoever, because as God's was the kingdom, power, and glory, so he was able and willing to strengthen his servants, that they might not be overpower'd by any of their enemies or difficulties whatsoever. Which shews, that this great and excellent person thought, that the doxology which he found in all the antient copies was added by our Lord himself, and could be look'd upon as no other than a part of that excellent *directory* that Christ gave to his Disciples.

To which if we add an *observation* that the learned Dr. *Towerson* * and other great men make, it may furnish us with another reason why this ought to be look'd upon as a part of the sacred scriptures. The observation is, that in no other part of the prayer (but this doxology) we have any direction about praise, which yet is as necessary a part of worship as prayer, strictly so call'd, can be supposed to be. So that, if the doxology should be taken away, the *form* or rather *directory* would be imperfect. To which I would add this farther observation, which will fully answer what Mr. H—† says, p. 147, 148, 149, about the *Jewish* prayers, and also confirm us in the belief of what

Chrysostom

† Vid. *Chrysof. Opera* in Homil. in *Mat. 6.* * *Towerson*, on the Lord's prayer, place before mention'd.

Chrysostom says, and that the doxology was not foisted into the prayer by some rash and impious hand, but put there by our saviour himself. The *observation* is this, *viz.* That if our blessed Saviour had not added this, or some such doxology, to the other parts of his prayer, he wou'd not have so fully answer'd the desire of his disciples, which was, that he wou'd *teach* them to pray, as *John* taught his disciples. We are not indeed particularly told how *St. John* taught them; but 'tis highly probable that *St. John* taught his disciples to pray according to the usual method of the *Jews*, with whom it was customary, either to conclude their prayers with some doxology, or to make it some part of their prayers. Of this we have a specimen, *I. Chron.* xxix. 11. where we have all the words of this doxology, tho' not deliver'd in the same order, that they are by *St. Matthew* nor with the same Conciseness, but thus: *Thine O Lord, is the greatness, and the power, and the glory, and the victory, and the Majesty; for all that is in heaven and in the earth is thine; thine is the kingdom, O Lord, and thou art exalted as head above all.*

This doxology was part of a Prayer that *David* offer'd under the inspiration of the *Holy-ghost*, and 'tis no way unlikely that this might be the model according to which *St. John* taught his disciples. And why may'nt we say, with great probability, that our Saviour also (who never car'd to differ from the *Jews* any farther than was necessary) might in directing his disciples to pray put a farther honour upon *David*, whose Son, and Lord he was, by inserting a part of his excellent prayer into his own? Some will have it as if our Lord's Prayer was taken from the *Jews*, as *Drusius*, *Lightfoot*, *Gregory*,

Gregory, &c. but this I see no reason to contend for. Our Saviour shew'd sufficient respect to *David*, and in him to the *Jews*, to *John*, and the request of his own disciples, by making the doxology I am pleading for a part of his prayer. I can't therefore help thinking, with *Chrysostom*, that the doxology was always a part of the prayer; nor doth this testimony of *Chrysostom* seem to be weaken'd by any thing that is offer'd by *Dr. Mill*, and from him by *Mr. H—t*, from *Gregory Nyssen*, and *Cyril of Jerusalem*; for they very probably tho't (as the more ancient Fathers did) from *St. Matthew's* way of expression, *ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ προσευχόμενοι*, after this manner therefore pray ye, that our Lord's prayer was rather a *Directory* than a *Form*; and therefore seeing it was a custom in the church not only then, but from the beginning of christianity, for christians to pay their solemn homage to *Father, Son, and Holy Ghost*, they tho't it no breach of duty and allegiance to conclude their prayers, and even the Lord's prayer, with the doxology that *Gregory* doth.*

I can't but think it to be clear and undeniable, that doxologies would never have been so commonly and constantly used as they were in *Gregory's* and *Cyril's* time, and long before them, if our Saviour had given no direction about this, as well as other parts of prayer. It plainly seems to be from this direction of our Saviour, and the practice of the Apostles, in pursuance of it, *I. Tim. i. 17. chap. vi. 16. Jude v. 25. and II. Tim. iv. 18.* where seems to be a plain reference to the last petition of the

* *Vid. Examen. Millii p. 29.*

the Lord's prayer, and the doxology that concludes it, that *Clemens Romanus* is so frequent in the use of doxologies. He useth a doxology no less than eight times in one epistle. And here I easily grant to Mr. H—t, that neither *Clemens* nor several of the *Greek Fathers* did use the very words of our Saviour in their doxologies, nor could they think themselves oblig'd in conscience to do it, if they tho't it to be only a *directory* for prayer, as well they might, and probably did. All that I contend for is, that the doxology in *Matthew* is a part of this *directory*, and that *Gregory* and *Cyril*, as well as *Chrysostom*, who were cotemporaries, or very near it, must have it in their Copies.

Dr. *Mill* is forc'd to acknowledge, that *Chrysostom* follow'd the Copies that were in use in that Age, i. e. Copies that were as ancient, or rather much more ancient than any that we now have. And how then could Mr. H—t venture to say, that the most ancient of the *Greek MSS.* knew nothing of it? Were they not *Greek* manuscripts that *Chrysostom* us'd? And was not that a very excellent one, from which, as Dr. *Mill* says, the famous *gothick version* which he speaks of with so much applause * was made, about 50 or 60 years after the council of Nice, viz. anno 375, or thereabouts, in which this doxology is found? The Doctor seems to have no doubt about its being in the most ancient *Greek* manuscripts, unless we reckon those so, (as we can't with any reason) that I have spoken about; only the Doctor tho't that the doxology was put into those manuscripts from the *Greek Liturgies*, which I shall soon consider.

But

* *Mill. Prolegom. p. 151.*

But Mr. H—t is more bold, tho' I dare say all the knowledge he hath of the *Greek* manuscripts is from Dr. *Mill*, who here fails him. So that it is without all ground or truth that Mr. H—t says, that the most ancient *Greek* manuscripts knew nothing of it, if Dr. *Mill*, *Glassius*, *Witsius*, Dr. *Whitby*, Dr. *Edwards*, Dr. *Towerson*, *Erasmus*, *Bellarmino* and other learned men, knew any thing of this matter. I might farther add (to shew that Mr. H—t had no ground for this *unprecedented confidence*) what *Isidorus Pelusiota*, says of this doxology, who by Mr. H—t's own confession flourish'd *Anno Christi* 440. He quotes it in the words we have in our Bibles, as that which was not then disputed; and which the wicked could not use without a great deal of sin and danger. Can it be thought that *Isidore* would thus speak, if it had been a controverted passage, and he had no ancient copies to support his reasoning upon it? I am apt to believe, that few besides Mr. H—t will venture to say so.

Mr. H—t is pleased to mention the *apostolical constitutions* as having the passage, tho' Mr. *Jones* did not. I believe Mr. *Jones* did not think it worth his while to take any notice of such a *mean author*, who is contemn'd by almost all the learned world, except Mr. *Whiston*, and some others of his *Stamp*; and perhaps Mr. H—t himself would not have mention'd him in the present case (tho' he pretends to do it in Favour of Mr. *Jones*'s notion as he calls it, p. 142.) if he had not us'd two different doxologies, of which Mr. H—t attempts to make an advantage: But how will that follow, which Mr. H—t advanceth from these two different readings in the apostolical constitutions,

stitutions, as they are call'd, that they were added to the Lord's-prayer by this *filly and inconsistent* writer? 'Tis possible, he might quote one as he found it in *St. Matthew*, & use another as a *whimsical and conceited man*, who thought perhaps, as some others do, that he could mend the scriptures. All that will follow as certain from this doughty author is, that doxologies were in use at that time. But I lay no stress upon such a paltry writer, tho' he says what's directly opposite to Mr. *H---*'s inference, *viz.* that the doxology was that which the Lord appointed in the gospel.

I come next to consider what Mr. *H---* says, p. 139. *viz.* ' that all the *Latin fathers* omit the doxology, as *Tertullian, Cyprian, Jerom, Ambrose, Austin, &c.* To which it is sufficient to answer, that they follow'd the *Latin manuscripts*, which Mr. *H---* speaks of, p. 150. as not having the doxology. But doth Mr. *H---* need to be told, that these *Latin manuscripts* are full of *faults and blunders*? That thro' the presumption of some, and the unskillfulness of others, and the carelessness of sleepy *library-keepers*, they were vitiated and depraved to that degree, and especially in the Gospels, that all was mixt and confus'd, that they differ'd so horribly among themselves, that they look'd rather like *various readings* of different *Greek copies* than *proper versions* of any one. This is the account that Dr. *Mill* gives of them from *Jerom*, who thought that a new version was necessary, but was himself afraid to make it correct according to the *Greek originals*, lest it should offend those of the *Latin church*. † If this

G

account

† *Mill. Prolegom. p. 81.*

account be true, Mr. H—t hath little reason to value himself upon the *Latin manuscripts*, and *Fathers*. Those *Fathers* us'd those manuscripts that they had, which were miserably corrupted. If therefore in this instance they differ from the *Greek manuscripts* and *Fathers*, as 'tis plain, I think, they do, they are but little to be regarded: And I am perswaded, Mr. H—t thinks so too, tho' to make his *catalogue* of those who oppose the doxology a little more *pompous*, he hath put them in.

But tho' the *Latin versions* deserve so little regard, that *Syriack version* that hath the doxology, and is allowed to be by far the best of the two *Syriack versions*, deserves a great deal. This version hath marks of such great antiquity upon it, that *Walton*, the compiler of the *Polyglot Bible*, thinks it was made very near the apostles time. A great many learned men think the same, amongst whom I reckon *Wissius*, Mr. *Jer. Jones*, &c. And if it be thus ancient, as I see no reason to doubt; it must be made from the most ancient *Greek* copies, and is therefore of very great weight in the present case. The great thing pleaded against its antiquity, by *Grotius* and *Dupin*, is, that it hath the doxology, and that it can't be more ancient than the use of *liturgies*; from which they take it for granted, the doxology was transferr'd into the Lord's-prayer: But this is plainly to beg the thing in question, and is so very weak in those great men, that, as Father *Simon* says, nothing can be weaker: For why, says he, * might not this passage be added to the *Syriack version*,

* Father *Simon's* Critic. Hist. of the New Test.

version, as well as the *Greek* copies, especially since the *Syrian* churches had their liturgies from the *Greeks*? But that any such addition was made to the Lord's-prayer from the liturgies of the church, is rather taken for granted than prov'd, by those great and learned men who do assert it.

I allow, that this is said by *Grotius*, *Dupin*, and most of the writers of the *Romish* church, and after them by *Dr. Mill*, and after him by *Mr. H—t*: But I can't but wonder, that those great men, whom *Mr. H—t* follows, should throw such an infamous reproach upon the Fathers of the church, (whom in other cases they manifest the fondest veneration for) as to charge them with foisting in their *own inventions* into the sacred scriptures, and attempting to impose something as deliver'd by Christ, which they knew was not. If any can believe that they were so rash and wicked as to do it in this instance, why mayn't they as well believe that they have done it in other instances? Which if it should be granted, it must render the authority of scripture very precarious. Farther, if this doxology was taken from the liturgies, and put into *St. Matthew*, 'tis unaccountable that these *interpolaters* should not have put it into *St. Luke* too, and so made the evangelists to harmonize with each other. Farther, 'tis very vainly pretended, that this doxology was taken from the *primitive liturgies*; because if the primitive writers would have been so wicked as to make such an addition to the sacred scriptures, they would have put in one or other of the doxologies that they us'd themselves, which yet in *form* do differ from that in *St. Matthew*. *Mr. H—t* himself argues that these eight dox-

ologies in *Clement's* epistle to the *Corinthians* do differ from it. He argues also, that that in *Gregory Nyssen* differs from it. To which I add, that that elder and famous one in *Polycarp*, mention'd by *Eusebius*, * as that which he offer'd when he suffer'd Martyrdom, differs also from it. I shall, to shew what the primitive christianity was, and how different from that which *Mr. H—t* professeth, throw it into the margin, † and present it with the prayer of which it is a part for the benefit of the english reader thus translated. Lord, I will praise thee, I will bless thee, I will glorify thee, through the eternal high priest Christ Jesus, thy beloved Son, by whom to thee, with him and the Holy-Ghost, be glory now and for ever more *Amen*.

I pass by the *apostolical constitutions*, where the doxology is found, because the book is of no credit, and the author and age of it are uncertain, I would ask *Mr. H—t* therefore, where these *liturgies* are to be found from which the doxology is said to be taken? To which question, I know no other answer can be given, but that *Dr. Mill* and some other learned men have said it. But to put it out of all doubt that this is said without any foundation, I add, that this doxology is more ancient than any liturgy that can be produc'd; for tho' I would by no means condemn those that use them, yet their *antiquity* is nothing so great as some learned men would have us believe, by whom

Mr.

* Vid. *Euseb.* Lib. 4. ch. 15. p. 133.

† Σε ἀ·νῶ σε ἐνλογῶ σε δοξάσω, διὰ τοῦ αἰωνίου ἀρχιερέως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ ἀγαπητοῦ σου παιδὸς· δι' οὗ σοὶ εὐχαριστοῦμεν ἐν πνεύματι ἀγίῳ δόξα καὶ νῦν καὶ τετελειώμενοι διὰ παντός· Ἀμήν.

Mr. H—t hath been led without consideration into an assertion that he is not, I believe, able to support : For let any one read what the *right honourable* author of the *constitution, discipline, &c.* of the *primitive church* hath said in the second part of that valuable Book, and they must, I believe, be convinced that there were no liturgies in the Church for the first 300 Years after Christ. He says, ‘ that there is not ‘ the least mention of them in any of the ‘ primitive writers, nor the least word or syllable tending thereto, that he could find, in any ‘ of the writings of the 3 first centuries, which ‘ silence says he, would be unaccountable, if ‘ ever such there were.’

Farther, this great and learned author says, that there are express intimations to the contrary, as particular, that remarkable one in *Justin Martyr’s* 2d Apology, p. 98. *ὅτι δύνανται, i. e.* they pray’d then as they were able. The phrase, he says, ‘ he generally, if not always, ‘ found to signify personal abilities,’ which he proves largely from *Origen*. * This also he proves from *Tertullian*, † who, giving an account of their publick prayers, says, that they did pray, *sine monitore, quia de pectore*. The meaning of which phrase he proves to be praying without a book. ‡ The same thing he farther proves from *Tertullian*, and also from *Cyprian*, † who both say, that their prayers were suited to their emergencies and present circumstances and that therefore they could not pray by any *set form*.
From

* *Constit. Discip. &c.* of the primitive church, pt. 2d. p. 42, 43, 44. † *Ibid.* p. 46. ‡ *Ibid.* p. 47. † *Ibid.* p. 47, 48.

From all this 'tis plain, that the doxology could not be taken from any liturgies in the 3 first centuries, because there were none. And if any will be at the pains to read what Mr. *Clarkson*, † Mr. *Robinson*, † Mr. *Peirce*, * and others, have said upon this Subject, and the answers that have been made to them by Dr. *Comber*, &c. they must, I believe, be convinc'd, that there were no such *liturgies* in being as this doxology is said to be taken from, 'till the 5th century, and that therefore the doxology must be of a more ancient date than the liturgies from which it is said to be taken. Mr. *H—t* therefore did not so well consider what he said in saying after Dr. *Mill*, that this doxology was added from the liturgies of the church: For 'tis in effect to say, that it was added from that which was not in being.

What poor grounds therefore could Mr. *H—t* have to say, p. 151. ' that this supposition ' was much confirm'd by observing that St. *Luke* hath not added any doxology to the ' Lord's-prayer when he recites it in his Gospel? ' For it is very far from being a consequence, that if our Saviour had added the doxology to the prayer, St. *Luke* would have mention'd it as well as St. *Matthew*. Might not Mr. *H—t* as well have said, that the prayer in St. *Matthew* is not our Saviour's, because it differs in other things as well as this from that in St. *Luke*? And might he not also as well have said, that the *beatitudes* in St. *Matthew* are not our Saviour's, because they are related otherwise than they are in St. *Luke*? Compare

‡ Discourse of Liturg. † Answer to Bennet. * Vindic. fratrum Dissent from p. 274 to p. 310.

pare *Mat.* 5th with *Luke* 6th. By the same reason Mr. *H—* might have said, that several other things in *St. Matthew* are not our Saviour's, because *St. Luke* doth not mention them: For if there be reason to correct *St. Matthew* by *St. Luke* in one place, there's the same reason that we should do it in another. But this is most absurd, and the truth is this, that our Saviour did most probably deliver the same things for *substance* more than once, but did not always think it necessary to deliver it in the same words, and so it is here. So that all that can be inferr'd from the silence of *St. Luke* is, that *St. Luke* relates what was deliver'd at one time, and *St. Matthew* that which was delivered at another: But then, as *Dr. Edwards* observes, ' the same may be said of all the evangelists, ' one hath that which the other hath not, and ' one passeth by that which another hath recorded. I could produce, says he, a hundred ' examples of this; and therefore, as he adds, ' this can't be made use of as an argument to ' to prove, that these words are not a part of ' the Lord's-prayer. 'Tis enough that *St. Matthew* expressly delivers them. This makes ' them canonical and authentick. This proves ' them to be a real portion of holy scripture. *

To the same purpose speaks the learned *Glassius*, † and, amongstot hers, gives these two instances of it. One is in the omission of the word *Amen* in the End of this Prayer, which even the *Latin* version retains, tho' *St. Luke* hath it not. The other is *Luke* xii. 31. compar'd with *Mat.* vi. 33. In *St. Luke* it is, *But rather seek*

* *Dr. Edwards's Theolog. Reform. Vol. 2d. p. 269.*

† *Glass. Philolog. p 151.*

seek ye the kingdom of God, and all these things shall be added unto you. In St. Matthew it hath this variation and addition, *But seek ye first the kingdom of God, and his righteousness, and all these things shall be added unto you.* This addition in St. Matthew is agreeable to the ancient copies, and makes no other difference than this between the two evangelists, that the one relates some things that were said and done by our Saviour that the other doth not. Might not Mr. H—t then have said, that this addition, as well as the doxology, crept into the text of St. Matthew from another original? The one, I think, is universally allowed to belong to the sacred text; and I would hope, I have made it sufficiently evident, that the doxology doth belong thereto likewise, and that it will be so esteemed, notwithstanding all that Mr. H—t hath said to the contrary.

I shall not sum up the evidence in all that pomp and formality that Mr. H—t hath done: But shall observe, that the *manuscripts* and *fathers*, and *criticks* in which the doxology is found, are by Mr. H—t's own allowance unexceptionable (tho' I would myself except the author *operis imperfecti*, and the trifling author of the apostolical constitutions, because 'tis uncertain who they were). Farther, I would observe, that the *Syriack version* that's for the doxology is allow'd to be vastly preferable to that which hath it not, and is of very great antiquity. That the *Arabick* in *Erpenius* and *Queen's College* hath very much the advantage of that in the *Polyglot*. That the *Gothick* and *Armenian versions* are allow'd by Dr. Mill, and consequently Mr. H—t, to be *noble versions*. To which I would add, to ballance Stephens's 2d
of

of the 11th century, that *Robert Stephens* testifies; that he found the doxology in a most ancient *Greek copy*, * from which character I would presume it must be a great deal more ancient than that which *Mr. H—t* quotes, tho' he doth not say how old it is.

As to the manuscripts and versions that have not the doxology, the character of all of them is very mean. The *Cambridge* is a most corrupt M. S. and such as hardly any man of sense will follow, where it differs from other MSS. The *Vatican* manuscript is so mean as not to deserve any regard, because made from a *Latin copy*, or corrected by it. The most I shall say of *Stephens's* 2d is, that it is of so late a date, that it must be of very little weight in this controversy. Both the *Syriack* and *Arabick* versions that omit the doxology are of such little esteem with men of learning, that a man of reputation would hardly quote them in opposition to the *Syriack* and *Arabick*, that bear a better character. Particularly of that *Arabick version* in the *Polyglot*, 'tis probable, as some think, that it was corrected by the *Latin*; but others think it was partly taken from the *Greek*, partly from a *bad Syriack version*. Without determining which of these conjectures hath the best foundation, 'tis evident, that this version can do *Mr. H—t's* cause no service. As to the *Saxon version*, this, according to *Dr. Mill*, was made from the *old Italick*, and probably corrected by *Beza's Cantabrigian* in those things wherein it agrees with it. † If these con-

H jectures

* *Wits. Exerc. in Orat. Domin. p. 236.* † *Millii Prolego. p. 152.*

jectures be right, this version can do Mr. H—t no kindness. As to the *Coptick version*, Dr. Edwards says it hath the doxology, † Dr. Mill says it hath not. But it can't be material which of these Doctors is in the right; for, according to Dr. Mill, it was compar'd with our copies; by which, I apprehend, he means, among the rest *Beza's, Cantabrigian*; and if it was corrected by them, as well as compar'd with them, as it is highly probable it was, Mr. H—t if, he hath this version on his side, hath no reason to boast of it. As to the *Latin manuscripts*, I wonder they should be mention'd, when they are so miserably mean and defective; and as to the *Latin and Greek Fathers*, who are against the doxology, I have offer'd, I think, what is abundantly sufficient to shew how far their authority is to be regarded in the present case. 'Tis sufficient to set aside all the authority of the *Latin Fathers*, that they follow'd the *Latin copies*, which are allow'd on all hands to be full of *faulcs and blunders*.

On the whole, therefore, I may venture to say in my turn, but with a great deal more truth and reason than Mr. H—t could, that from this view of facts, it is plain, that the best *Greek manuscripts and fathers*, as also the best and most ancient versions have the doxology, and that there is not one copy or version of any credit that hath it not. That it was not foisted into the text from any *laurgies*, or *later authors*, but was always in it; and that we may as justifiably plunder away any other part of the scriptures as we may this.

Mr.

† Dr. Edwards's Theolog. Reform. Vol. 2d. p. 269.

Mr. H—t's 8th discourse examin'd, and the ten commandments prov'd to be still in force, and to oblige christians, &c.

THE author of this discourse seems sensible, that what he was about to advance therein was likely to give offence to serious christians, and therefore is pleas'd to begin his discourse thus, ' p. 152. I think it needful to observe, that I readily grant that christians are oblig'd to perform most of the duties which are required, and to abstain from most of the things that are forbidden in the ten commandments.' But as if he had granted too much in this *loose passage*, which looks friendly enough to some sins, and the *omission* of some duties, whatever they be, he seems to retract it in the very next page, telling us, ' that these precepts, which required moral duties of the Jews, don't oblige us.' This passage is shocking, and plainly dangerous to *morality*, and was very likely to kindle a just indignation in every pious reader against his main design, which was to overturn the *ten commandments*. He is therefore pleas'd to add, (tho' evidently inconsistent with many other expressions, and what he seem'd principally to have in view) p. 153. ' That the same God, who required these moral duties of the Jews, hath requir'd (as strictly and under more awful sanctions) the same moral duties of us.' But if Mr. H—t hath any meaning in this expression, and one or two more to the same purpose, which are the only seemingly *softning expressions* which he hath in a discourse of 23 pages, why is there such a *vanour* discover'd against the ten commandments? And why are we told, p. 166. ' That

‘ the new testament is so far from obliging
 ‘ christians to obey the ten commandments,
 ‘ that it frequently declares they are abolish’d,
 ‘ and cease to be a rule to the church of God,
 ‘ tho’ the gentiles are taken into the same
 ‘ church with the *Jews*.’?

There are so many expressions in Mr. *H—t*’s discourse to the same purpose, and that look with so ill an aspect upon *morality*, that it seems too likely that those two or three expressions that look favourable thereto might not have been added at all, unless for such another *paltry reason*, as is given for Mr. *P---ce*’s inserting the ten commandments into his *catechism*, lest the omission of them should raise an unconquerable prejudice against the whole *catechism*. If Mr. *H—t* had any thing else in view than to stifle mens just prejudices against his many shocking expressions, why should he thus say, and unsay, in the same breath? Pretend to be a friend to *morality* and *virtue*; and yet say, that the ten commandments, these *admirable rules* of moral virtue, are no rules to us? I could never see how ’tis possible that moral precepts should be abolish’d, or cease to be rules to mankind, whether *Jews*, or *Christians*, *Mahometans*, or *Heathens*. They flow from the reasons of things, and are as unalterable as virtue and vice themselves. And this holds true as to every one of those laws that Mr. *H---t* would ravish from the christian church, not excepting the substance of the fourth commandment itself, as I shall shew afterwards.

I hope to make it very evident, that *Christ* and his *apostles* had very different apprehensions of these laws from what Mr. *H—t* hath. If they had not, it would have been a just prejudice

judice against our *Saviour*, his *religion*, and *all* that should attempt to spread it through the world. For how could the world have ever thought favourably of our blessed Saviour, if he had attempted (as the *Jews* suggested he did) to *destroy the law and the prophets*? And deliver'd such things for doctrine as Mr. *H—t* doth? Which I here set before the reader in one view, which will, I believe, be surprizing to most, and even to some who are most prejudic'd in Mr. *H—t*'s favour.

That which Mr. *H—t* says is, ' That even
 ' these precepts in the *Jewish* religion that re-
 ' quire moral duties don't oblige us. p. 153.
 ' That to say, that the moral part of the *ten*
 ' *commandments* doth oblige christians, is a
 ' strange and indefensible notion, p. 154. That
 ' the *ten commandments* were given to the *Jews*,
 ' and them only, and don't oblige christians.
 ' *ibid.* That it can't be thought, that God
 ' spake these ten to the People with his own
 ' voice, to imply that these were of a more
 ' exalted and extraordinary nature than the
 ' rest of the commands that he had to give
 ' them; that God did not design to distin-
 ' guish these *ten commandments* from the rest, but
 ' the distinction was made by the people, and
 ' accidentally, p. 157, 158. That the reason why
 ' God wrote the ten, and not the rest (*i. e.*
 ' *the ceremonial laws*) was because he, with his
 ' own voice, had pronounc'd the ten, and not
 ' the rest in the audience of the people; 159.
 ' That the *ten commandments* were not intended
 ' (any more than the rest of the laws given
 ' at mount *Sinai*) for any other people, and
 ' that the arguments that prove, that christi-
 ' ans are not oblig'd to obey the *Mosaic* law
 ' in

* in general, necessarily prove, they are not
 * bound by the *ten commandments* in particular,
 * p. 160, 161. and *ib.* that there are several ar-
 * guments which directly prove, that these
 * don't oblige christians: That if we can't prove
 * that we are some of the *Jews* posterity, we
 * can't prove that we are laid under any ob-
 * ligation to obey the *ten commandments*. That
 * unless these *ten commandments* had been pub-
 * lish'd a second time with a new preface di-
 * rected to other people, it will not be easy
 * to imagine, that the *ten commandments* were
 * designed to oblige any others. That if God
 * had intended, that the gentile world should
 * have observ'd the same *ten commandments*, he
 * would have reveal'd his will to them in this
 * respect, p. 161, 162.

* That the new testament is so far from ob-
 * liging christians to obey the *ten command-*
 * * ments, that it frequently declares they are
 * * abolish'd, and cease to be a rule to the church
 * * of God. That Christ's Apostles were not
 * * ministers of the *ten commandments*; and
 * * therefore these commands don't oblige chri-
 * * stians, p. 166. That if the Apostles were not
 * * ministers to promulgate the *ten commandments*
 * * to the world, and to call mankind to obey
 * * them, it can't be thought that they oblige
 * * christians. That the Apostle represents the
 * * *ten commands* and the Gospel as two different
 * * and inconsistent things, p. 167. That the *ten*
 * * *commandments*, like the other parts of the
 * * *Mosaic law* can't be part of the gospel, but
 * * are put in opposition to the gospel, p. 168.
 * * That they are part of that law which was
 * * our *Pædagog*, and under which we are
 * * now no longer, p. 169. That if the Apostles
 * * had

' had thought that christians are oblig'd to o-
 ' bey the *ten commandments*, they would have
 ' excepted them as well as these four necessary
 ' things, *viz.* fornication, blood, things stran-
 ' gled, and meats offer'd to idols. But they
 ' were not intended to be excepted, but are
 ' look'd upon as part of the law of *Moses*,
 ' which the gentile christians are not to be
 ' commanded to keep, p. 169, 170. That they
 ' [i. e. the Apostles] declare, that the *Gentiles*
 ' are to observe nothing requir'd in the law of
 ' *Moses* besides the four fore-mention'd rules.
 ' That the sabbath is one thing mention'd in
 ' the law of *Moses*, which christians are not
 ' requir'd to observe, p. 171. That *Heb. xii.*
 ' 18, &c. seems to imply, that the *ten command-*
 ' *ments* are not part of the new covenant,
 ' whereof Jesus is the mediator, p. 172. That
 ' they are like any other set of the *Mosaic* laws.
 ' Moral and ceremonial precepts are mingled
 ' together; and that there are some ceremoni-
 ' al precepts among the moral ones in the ten
 ' commandments. That he can't see the ab-
 ' solute necessity of teaching children the *ten*
 ' *commandments*. That instead of the first com-
 ' mandment, he should choose that of the
 ' gospel, *Turn from these vanities to the living God.*
 ' Instead of the second I should choose, *Neither*
 ' *be ye idolaters, as were some of them.* Instead
 ' of the third, I should choose, *The law is made*
 ' *for perjured persons, and for every other thing that*
 ' *is contrary to sound doctrine according to the gos-*
 ' *pel, &c.* p. 173. That he perswaded Mr. Peirce
 ' to leave the ten commandments out of his
 ' catechism, p. 174. To all which he adds in his
 ' next discourse, that ' the commads of the old
 ' testament were peculiarly given to the Jews;
 ' and

‘ and that the promises of the old testament
 ‘ were peculiarly made to the *Jews*,’ p. 177.

I have chosen thus to set Mr. *H—t*’s strange and unaccountable expressions in one view before the the reader, to let him see, that I have not taken the advantage of one or two unguarded expressions, which may possibly drop from a person more critical and cautious than even Mr. *H—t* himself; but such a train of expressions to the same purpose must abundantly convince all, that, if he design’d any thing in them, it was to put persons out of conceit with the *ten commandments*. But what *hurt* have these *ten commandments* done to christianity, or christians, that they are so *rudely* and *unmercifully* treated? I can’t help thinking, that Mr. *H—t* might have served the purposes of *religion* and his *office* better, if, instead of discovering so much spleen and rancour against the *ten commandments*, which have so much of *native excellency* and *recommendation* in them, he had left christians in their quiet possession, and taught his people, and the world, to regulate their conversations by them. This would have been to act a friendly part as to *morality*. Whereas to draw persons into a mean opinion of a great part of their bibles, and particularly these very laws which our Saviour expressly declares they must keep if they would enter into life, *Mat. xix. 17.* this, I must think, hath a natural tendency to do a great deal of mischief. ’Tis the ready way to sink mens regard to *morality*, and to extinguish the *poor remains* of piety and vertue that are in the world.

If Mr. *H—t* had a more particular pique against some of the *commandments*, as the
fourth

fourth which he mentions, and the *first* which he does not, but will forever be irreconcilable with his *darling notion of his having and worshipping more Gods than one*, why had he not struck out these only, and substituted, as he hath done, some others in their room, as the *Papists* and some others have done before him? But, like a man of courage, he cashiered them all at once, telling us that it is not defensible to observe the moral, unless we observe the ceremonial law too.

I can't indeed say, that Mr. *H——* is the first that made this bold attempt upon the moral law. Dr. *Whitby* says, * that the *Gnosticks* were the greatest adversaries of the law and the prophets, and even rejectors of that God who gave the one, and inspir'd the other. That *Simon Magus* taught, that the prophets receiv'd their prophecies only from Angels, and that therefore they that believ'd in him, and his *Selene*, should not regard them. The next noted adversary of the law and the prophets was *Marcion*, Anno Christi 130, who with *Cerdo* held, that there were two principles, or Gods, one *superiour*, the father of Jesus Christ, the other *inferior*, the maker of the universe, spoken of in the law and the prophets; that Christ was sent by the superior God, that he might destroy the works of the inferior, together with *the law and the prophets*; and therefore held, among other monstrous opinions, that the doctrine of Christ was *different* from that under the law, and *plainly contrary* to it, and that all things ought to be expung'd out of the

I

gospels

* *Whitby* on I. Tim. i. 7.

gospels and epistles, that were taken from the old testament. * † ‡ That which historians farther observe of him was, that he was a proud, bold, conceited man, and that his notions, tho' shocking, were embrac'd by many, and did a great deal of mischief, tho' detested by the greatest part of the christian World.

The next that appeared as a noted champion for some of these wild notions was *Manes*, from whom came the sect of the *Manichees*, Anno Christi 275. This, according to historians, was a time of some respite from persecution, but, according to the complaint of *Eusebius*, a time when there was a very lamentable corruption in faith and manners, and therefore a very proper season for the Devil to sow his tares in; and now it was that one *Cubrianus*, according to *Socrates* and *Epiphanius*, took upon him the name of *Manes*; and boasting that he was the *Paraclete*, and an apostle, attempted to diffuse these wicked and abominable notions, that there were two eternal Gods, one good, and the other bad. That the old law was evil, and that the whole of the old testament was bad, and from the Devil. ** *St. Austin* himself was drawn into some of these blasphemous notions; but afterwards retracted them, and wrote largely against them. I suppose, Mr. H. will hardly own those for his patrons, whose characters have been infamous in all the churches for so many ages: But I wish he had a little better consider'd what incredible mischief these extravagant opinions did to the church of God, and

* *Mill. Prolegom.* p. 34. † *Horn. Hist. Eccles.* p. 181.

‡ *Epiph. contra Heret.* p. 137. ** *Horn. Hist. Eccles.* p. 201.

and the souls of Men, and what mischief his own monstrous and undigested notions, (too near akin to some of those I have mention'd) are likely to do in an age so *sceptical* and *licentious*; and then, if he had been such a friend to virtue as he pretends, he would probably have suppress'd these notions, and kept them to himself, because (to say the softest thing of them) they have a very threatening aspect upon religion.

I can't at all doubt but Mr. H—t is ready to say, with a noted author, I mean the author of the *fable of the bees*, that he had no design to encourage prophaness, and to promote immorality, and the corruption of manners: But whatever an author's design may be in writting books, he should be very cautious how he writes. When a man pretends innocency of intention, it must be very odd to extol wickedness so extravagantly, as if it was absolutely necessary for the good of Society; that he should so much applaud the usefulness of publick stews, and tell mankind, that what we call evil in this world, moral as well as natural, is the grand principle that makes us sociable creatures, the solid basis, the life and support of all trades and employments without exception; that the moment such evils cease, the society must be spoil'd, if not totally dissolv'd; and that religion and the prosperity of a nation are inconsistent things.' Are not such expressions an *outrageous satire* upon religion? And what could a man have said worse, if he had openly profess'd, that his design was to promote immorality?

I can't pretend to say what Mr. H—t's design was in writing against the *ten command-*

ments; he best knows himself what his *inward regards* are to *moral virtue*; but when he shall attempt to raze the *ten commandments* out of the bible, which have been ever thought such *substantial fences* of it, and when besides he shall say in effect, that there is no such thing as *natural religion*, as he evidently seems to do, by destroying all the awful sanctions of what he sometimes calls the law of nature; when a person shall thus attempt to overturn all natural religion, out of a pretended zeal for revelation, and at the same time throw aside a great part of reveal'd religion, as that in which christians have no concern, whatever the person and his pretences may be, I am sure, his notions are far from being favourable to the interests of religion, and we may justly complain of such authors, and their *wild and groundless fancies*, as our Saviour did of the *Pharisees*, those ancient *pretended patrons* of moral virtue, that as the one *made void the commandments of God by their traditions*, so the other attempts to do it by their *bold assertions*, and that they do a great deal of ill service in the world. If this be done without design, 'tis so much the better: But it requires, methinks, none of that uncommon penetration, that this author (by the *airs* that he sometimes assumes) would be tho't to have, to discern the mischeivous tendency of a great many things that he hath thought fit to lay before the world, and some of which I now come more closely to examine.

To make way for what he attempts to prove, *viz.* That the ten commandments don't oblige christians, he tells us, p. 152, 153, 'That if God gives a particular law to another, and not to us, we are not bound to obey that law,

• law, because God never intended we should
 • be obliged by it, and then instanceth in that
 • law that oblig'd the *Jewish* males to go up
 • three times a year to *Jerusalem*; and then
 argues very strongly that tho' this was a law
 of God, it could never oblige all mankind,
 and then very learnedly computes how many
 miles those who were antipodes to the *Jews*
 must travel in one day, *viz.* near forty miles.

But to what purpose is all this waste of learning, if no body was ever so weak as to think so? 'Twould have been allow'd to Mr. H—t without any opposition, and without bringing the wise instance he does to support his judicious observation, that God may give laws to oblige some persons that don't oblige others: But what is that *political law* that Mr. H—t mentions to those laws that are of a *moral*, and therefore *immutable, nature*, and consequently obligatory upon all mankind? I wonder Mr. H—t should imagine, that his fondest admirers, or any reader, should be so weak as to think, that this was an instance to his purpose.

Mr. H—t should have remembred, that he was opposing commandments, several of which he himself allows to be of a moral nature; and therefore, if he would have brought an instance to serve such a turn, it should have been one of a *parallel nature*, such as that, *Deut. vi. 5. Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thine heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy might*: or that *Levit. xix. 18. Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thy self*: And if he could have prov'd these laws to concern none but such as could prove themselves *Jews*, it might have been of weight to serve his design; but to talk of a law that did oblige only the *males* among the *Jews*, when

when he was attempting to overturn moral precepts, is, I confess, a way of talking out of the common road ; but such as few are likely to be fond of, unless they are deeply infected with the same *itch of novelty* as Mr. H—t seems to be, or are very defective some where else.

Mr. H—t proceeds, and tells us, p. 153. ' That the *Mosaic* contain'd precepts of different kinds, some of which related to positive institutions and ceremonies of religion, others requir'd moral duties ; that both these precepts oblig'd the *Jews*, but neither of them oblige us ; and in the next page, that they don't oblige christians.' The plain sence of which is, (according to his own explication in another place) that they don't oblige christians any more than the ceremonial law. But is there no difference between these laws in point of obligation ? Can it be said of the ceremonial, as it is of the moral laws, that they are, *i. e.* in their own nature, *holy, just, and good* ? Does not Mr. H—t remember, what *Ezekiel* says of the ceremonial laws, *Ezek. xx. 25. viz. that God gave them Statutes that were not good* ? Hath he forgot how *Isaiah* doth distinguish between them ? * Does our Saviour put them upon an equal foot, as Mr. H—t is pleas'd to do, when he taxeth the *Pharisees* with their over-scrupulous zeal, in paying *tithe of Mint, anise and cummin*, and omitting the weightier matters of the law, *judgment, mercy, and faith* ? *Mat. xxiii. 23* ? Can it be said of the ceremonial laws, that if we would enter into life, we must keep these commandments ? Or is it true, that we shall,

* Chap. i. 11, 12, 13, 14. &c. Chap. 66. 3.

shall, if we don't observe the moral law? Was it of the ceremonial, as well as moral laws, that our Saviour says, *Mat. v. 19, Whosoever therefore shall break one of these least commandments, and shall teach men so, he shall be called least in the kingdom of heaven?*

If there was not a vast difference as to the obligation of moral and ceremonial laws, why should the same moral duties be requir'd under the Gospel as were requir'd by the ten commandments? Are christians under the same obligations to these purifications, sacrifices, ceremonies that the Jews were to observe, as they are to have no other God for their God but the God of *Israel*, as they are not to make to themselves any graven image to worship it, &c.? If Mr. H--t could see no difference in these laws as to their obligation, the Apostle could, and therefore tells us, *Rom. viii. 4. that the righteousness of the law must be fulfill'd in us*, which I think Dr. Manton on the place well explains, when he says, that it was given to be a rule to believers in Christ, and that they fulfil it when they are sincere in their conformity thereto. And as St. Paul saw a Difference in these laws in point of obligation, so also did St. James, and therefore calls the moral law a royal law, a law of liberty, and a law by which we shall be judged, *James ii. 8, 9, 10, 11.* 'Tis evident, that the Apostle in this place had his Eye upon the ten commandments, because he particularly mentions some of the laws of the second table, and that summary of the whole second table that his great lord and master had given, *Thou shalt love thy Neighbour as thyself.* But farther, this Apostle requires the observation of these Laws, for a reason which shews that

that they are binding upon christians as well as Jews. 'Tis a law by which we shall be judged: And if it will be the *rule of judgment*, it can't but be the *rule of life*. If it will be enquir'd at the great day, whether we acted according to the law of the ten commandments, they must necessarily be still in force. Mr. H——t, I believe, with all his *confidence*, will hardly venture to say, that we christians shall be judged by the *ceremonial*; nor can he without contradicting the Apostle deny, that we shall be judged by the *moral law*.

But then, Mr. H——t observing what some have said of the fourth commandment, that that part of it that is not moral doth not bind us, says, p. 154. 'that this is strange and infensible, and that he could not forbear thinking, that we are oblig'd to obey all and every part of the ten commandments, or none of them at all.' But where's the *sense* or *logick* of this? Christians according to Mr. H——t are not oblig'd to observe the *Jewish sabbath*, or saturday; therefore they are not oblig'd to love and worship God at all, therefore they are not oblig'd to abstain from idolatry, from taking the name of God in vain, &c. This is very *poor logick*, and *worse divinity*. But after all, why may not the fourth commandment oblige us to keep holy some day, tho' not the *Jewish sabbath*? The commandment is, *Remember the sabbath day to keep it holy*, &c. which seems to refer to a day which was well known to the Jews before they came into the wilderness of Sinai, and to be a *republication* of that ancient institution of the sabbath which we have, Gen. ii. 3. So that what this law requires, (as is farther suggested in the commandment)

mandment) is, that we should keep holy to the Lord a seventh part of time, or the day after six days labour. Mr. H—t won't venture I hope, to say, that God ought not to be worshipp'd publickly, or that there ought not to be some particular and stated time for his worship. If there was not, (as I have heard it pleaded by one of Mr. H—t's Friends) it would destroy all regular publick worship, and in a little time be of fatal consequence to all religion. I conclude, therefore, that there is some particular time for worship, call'd of *old* the sabbath, and in the *new testament*, the first day of the week, and the Lord's-day. This commandment therefore may require, that this first day, or Lord's-day, should be observ'd after six days labour; and thus the design of the commandment is answer'd, as well by *Christians* as *Jews*. And it doth, I think, so far concern both, as to require, that a seventh part of time should be kept holy to the Lord. This is all that is mention'd in the commandment; and as to the specification of that particular seventh day, that shall be observ'd as sacred to the service of God, we are to look to other places of Scripture for that. A seventh part of time is all that the law requires; but whether this shall be on *friday*, which is the *Mahometan sabbath*, or on *saturday*, which is the *Jewish*, or on that which we *Christian*, and the *Gentile world* observe, this must be determin'd some other way than by the fourth commandment: But this, I have thoughts, God willing, to lay more largely before the world in a little time in some discourses on the fourth commandment.

Mr. H—t, I think, is very much mistaken in saying, p. 154, 'That these commandments

K

were

' were given to the *Jews*, and them only.' This is only asserted, and not prov'd; yea, it is very evident that they were design'd to be of a much farther extent. There was not a nation upon earth, when these laws were deliver'd, but was oblig'd to worship the God of *Israel*, and him only, because the only living and true God. There was not a people under heaven but was oblig'd to *turn from these vanities that they ador'd to this living God*. According to the Apostle, I. Cor. ix. 8, the ceremonial law, in which the *Gentiles* were least likely to be concern'd, was some way intended for their use: *Say I these things as a man? or saith not the law the same also? For it is written in the law of Moses; thou shalt not muzzle the mouth of the Ox that treadeth out the corn. Doth God take care of Oxen? Or saith it altogether for our sake? For our sake no doubt this is written, that he that ploweth should plow in hope, and he that thresheth in hope should be partaker of his hope.* The Apostle in this passage plainly shews, that tho' the force of this law, as to the ceremony of it, was abolish'd, yet, as to the moral of it, it was still binding. And how then can we think otherwise of these laws that are purely moral? And can't cease to bind, seeing they carry an immutable goodness and obligation in them. The Apostles, and particularly St. Paul, whom this author allows to be one of the most zealous assertors of our christian liberty, doth yet very often suggest, that the moral law was design'd to oblige us. Thus he urgeth the children of the *Ephesians*, who were *Gentile christians*, and consequently all christian children, to obey their parents, and that on the account of the fifth commandment, *Ephes. vi. 1.*

To

To the same purpose, when urging the *Roman* christians not to *avenge themselves*, he enforceth his advice from the law of Moses, *Deut. xxxii. 35.* for it is written, *Vengeance is mine*; and to the same effect he urgeth that, *Prov. xxv. 21. If thine enemy hunger, feed him, &c.* The Apostle then was of opinion, (tho' Mr. H—t be not) that what was written aforetime was written for our learning, that we through patience and comfort of the scriptures, *i. e.* those of the old testament, might have hope, *Rom. xv. 4.* That all scripture, by which he must include, if not wholly mean, that of the old testament, was given by inspiration of God, and was profitable for Doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness, that the man of God may be perfect, &c. *II. Tim. iii. 16, 17.* But how could this be, if the moral precepts of the old testament were given to the *Jews*, and them only? And farther, this same Apostle, (who says, *Col. ii. 14.* that Christ hath taken away the handwriting of ordinances that was against us, and contrary to us, and nail'd it to his cross, *i. e.* the ceremonial law) doth make no difficulty of saying, in another place, that the moral law is still in force, *Rom. xiii. 8, 9, 10.* The Apostle, as he had in another place urg'd the *fifth commandment* as still binding on christians, so in this he repeats the remaining *five commandments* of the second table, as they stand in the decalogue, and urgeth them upon christians as laws that were design'd for them, and by which they ought to govern themselves; and this, as he says afterwards, was to put on the Lord Jesus Christ, or to act as the disciples of Christ are oblig'd to do.

This, methinks, should convince Mr. H—t, unless above or past conviction, that the moral law is still in force, when the very commandments themselves, as deliver'd to the *Jews*, are recited, and urg'd upon christians, in the very words in which they were deliver'd, and that also by that very Apostle who was the Apostle of the Gentiles, and the Apostle that Mr. H—t pretends to have a distinguishing veneration for. Nor cou'd it in the least weaken the obligation of the ten commandments, if the Apostles had only wrote to *Jews*, or that 'twas a *Jew* to whom our Saviour said, that if he would enter into life, he must keep the commandments; for at this rate we might vacate almost all that was deliver'd by our Saviour himself. He tells us, *that he was not sent but to the lost sheep of the house of Israel*: But will Mr. H—t therefore infer, that nothing in the gospels doth oblige us, but these few things that were delivered to the *Syrophœnian woman*, the *woman of Samaria*, and some of the *Samaritans* that came with her to Jesus, the *Roman centurion*, and the *Roman governour Pilate*? 'Tis most absurd, and I think even profane, to suggest, that nothing can oblige us that was deliver'd to the *Jews*; for, according to this method of reasoning, most of these things that are deliver'd in the gospels must run the same fate with the *old testament*. I would hope that 'tis not Mr. H—t's design to overturn both: But I can name the person, one of Mr. H—t's own kidney, and once thought to be an oracle of the party, who speaking in the same contemptible manner of the old testament as Mr. H—t doth, told me, that we had no occasion for more than *one* of the four gospels. What would such

such persons bring all revealed religion to, if let alone! I might observe, how many of its most important doctrines have been given up already by some, in complaisance to the deists, or their own reason: And how soon the fancy may take them to sacrifice the rest I can't say: But yet I can't but tremble to think of those outrageous Insults that have been lately made upon revelation. What must become of religion in a little time, when it is thus stript of so much of its faith and morality too!

Mr. H—t is pleas'd to observe, p. 154, 155. 'That the ten commandments were not intended to be a summary of all moral duties.' And then banters the explication, that some have given of the fifth commandment. This is plainly a fling at the assembly's catechism, which says, that the moral law is summarily comprehended in the ten commandments, and the fifth commandment requireth the preserving the honour and performing the duties belonging to every one in their several places and relations, as superiours, inferiours, and equals. 'Tis no hard matter to guess, why Mr. H—t should be so much out of temper with those excellent persons that compos'd this catechism. They were zealous for the doctrine of the ever blessed Trinity, which according to Mr. H—t is nonsense and jargon, as they deliver it in the fifth and sixth answers of their catechism: But why should they be treated with so much contempt, and this wonderful reason given for it, that it was plain to him, that there were many moral commands which are not comprehended in the ten? Why had not Mr. H—t told us what these commands are? Mr. H—t can't take it amiss to be told, that it doth not seem so mo-

deft to insult fuch great and good men as Dr. Twiss, Mr. Gataker, Bp. Reynolds, Dr. Lightfoot, Mr. Bowles, &c. and thofe learned gentlemen that were appointed to meet with them, as Mr. Selden, Mr. Whitlock, &c. a list of which we have in Dr. Calamy. † I eafily allow, they were but men, and not blindly to be follow'd: But then many of them were men of extraordinary learning, and others of extraordinary piety. And 'tis no difparagement to Mr. H—t to fay, that many of them had vastly more learning than he hath had time or means to get, and could fee much farther into things than he can. But, after all, where's the absurdity of what they fay? Mr. H—t can't be ignorant, that thefe commandments of God which David fo much extols, and he difpifeth, are exceeding broad, *Pfal.* cxix. 96. The fenfe and meaning of them is very extenfive, more extenfive a great deal than the expreffion. 'Tis evident, that there are more duties requir'd by thefe laws than are exprefs'd, and more fins prohibited than are mention'd. And, accordingly, our Saviour, (who I hope will be allow'd by Mr. H—t, notwithstanding his mean and difparaging opinion of him, to be the beft judge of the meaning of thefe laws) when he was ask'd, which was the great commandment of the law, *i. e.* of the law that was given to the Jews, his answer is, *Mat.* xxii. 37, 38. Thou fhalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, &c. Now this is not exprefsly contain'd in any of the ten commandments, but it is fairly imply'd in thefe precepts, the love of God in

† Dr. Calamy's Abridg. &c. 1. Vol. 2d. Edi. p. 82, 83, 84.

in the commandments of the first table, and the love of our neighbour in the precepts of the second.

In like manner, this *great legislator*, and *infallible interpreter* of his own mind and will, in speaking particularly to some of these laws, acquaints us, that more is to be understood than is express'd. Thus in giving us the sense of the third commandment, tho' it only expressly forbids perjury, or false-swearing, yet our Saviour assures us, that swearing in our common and ordinary conversation is forbidden thereby. And so, in speaking to the sixth commandment, he tells us, that not only murder is forbid thereby, but also all rash and causeless anger. In like manner, speaking to the seventh commandment, he tells us, that if we would keep to the meaning and extent of the law, *we must not look on a woman to lust after her*. These are not new additional moral precepts, as the *Socinians* suggest, * but expositions of the old law, and declarative of the latitude and extensiveness thereof. The *Pharisees* by their corrupt glosses had so debauch'd and perverted the law, that a person might be guilty of almost all manner of wickedness, and yet according to them be no transgressors of the law. Our Saviour therefore gives us a *true comment* upon the law, and plainly shews us, that the law did not only oblige persons to the duties therein mention'd, but to all duties of the same kind, and also to the means that are proper to the faithful and effectual performance of them. Our Saviour also acquaints
us,

* *Catech. Eccles. Polon. &c. p. 114. &c.*

us, that the law doth not only oblige persons to abstain from the particular sins therein mention'd, but from all sins of the same kind, together with every thing that may be an occasion, provocation, or temptation to commit them. So, that what *David* says of these laws (the use of which Mr. H—t attempts to vacate, and throw out of the Church) is most true, *The law of the Lord is perfect.* And I can't but be astonish'd, that what the psalmist under *inspiration* bestows so many high and extraordinary encomiums upon, Mr. H—t should manifest no more regard to. And then particularly, as to the fifth commandment, where's the absurdity of it to extend it to *kings, priests, prophets*? Han't all these often the title of *Father* in scripture? And is there not a measure of honour due to them? And if we are to honour them, are they not oblig'd in conscience to be concern'd for the good of those that pay them this honour, tho' much their inferiours? What need was there that the law should be more express and particular, where the duties are relative and the obligations mutual? So that in the explications that some have given of the fifth commandment, which is plainly a law about relative duties, there is nothing so surprizing as that a person of Mr. H—t's pretended learning should be so grossly mistaken in so plain a case.

What Mr. H—t offers next, in p. 155. and five following pages is all *wild and groundless conjecture*, but withal so *bold, extravagant, and shocking*, as would tempt one to think, that he would stick at nothing to serve an hypothesis. He says, p. 157. 'It can't be thought that God spake these *ten* to the people with his own

own voice, to imply that these were of a more exalted and extraordinary nature than the rest of the commands, which he had to give them. But why can't this be thought, when the very nature of the commands themselves shews, that they are of a more exalted and extraordinary nature? when God himself is pleas'd to speak of them as the *principal* and *more eminent* parts of that covenant which he made with the children of *Israel*, *Exod. xxxiv, 28.* If Mr. H—t can see no difference as to *intrinsic goodness* between *moral* and *ceremonial* laws, this seems rather to proceed from an unaccountable fondness for the groundless notions that he hath advanc'd, than from any reason that he had for such an assertion. 'Tis plain that the scripture every where speaks of *moral duties* as the *main* and *fundamental duties* of the *Jewish* religion. The ceremonial law was of no account with God in comparison of the moral law, even under the *Jewish* dispensation. *Mic. vi. 6, 7, 8. Wherewith shall I come before the Lord, and bow myself before the high God? Shall I come before him with burnt-offerings, with calves of a year old? Will the Lord be pleas'd with thousands of rams, or ten thousand rivers of oil? &c. He hath shewed thee, O man, what is good; and what doth the Lord require of thee, but to do justly, and to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God?* According to Mr. H—t, the moral law seems to be of no higher account than that ceremonial one, *thou shalt not seeth a kid in his mother's milk*, p. 159. What disparaging apprehensions must he have of *moral* *religion*? And how much juster notions had that scribe of *moral precepts*, that came to our Saviour, and is commended by him for his dis-

creet answer, than this pretended christian divine? *Mark, xii, 32, 33, 34. Well master, thou hast said the truth, for there is one God, and there is none other but he; and to love him with all the heart, and with all the understanding, and with all the soul, and with all the strength, and to love his neighbour as himself, i. e. thus to act, as directed by the moral law, is more than all burnt-offerings and sacrifices. The Apostle speaks very much to the same purpose, Gal. vi. 15. In Christ Jesus, neither circumcision availeth any thing, nor uncircumcision, but a new creature. And so in I. Cor. vii. 19. he delivers much the same thing, but with some alteration of the phrase; by which we may plainly see what he intended. Circumcision is nothing, and uncircumcision is nothing, but the keeping the commandments of God, i. e. these commandments that were of a moral nature. Circumcision was of divine appointment, and had its place in the Jewish religion, and was to continue while their polity lasted: But the ten commandments were to continue longer, even as long as christianity itself did. And 'twas to promote and encourage obedience to these laws that our Saviour offered himself a sacrifice, promiseth pardon, justification, and eternal life, and such assistances of his grace as might be every way suitable to make us obedient to these laws. These laws therefore were of a more exalted and extraordinary nature. God owns, Jer. vii. 22, 23. tho' Mr. H—t will not, that they were of higher account with him.*

Concerning the ceremonial law, we may observe, there are several such questions and expressions in scripture: *Will the Lord be pleas'd with thousands of Rams, &c. Thou desirest not sacrifice*

sacrifice &c. But can Mr. H—t, with all his pretended learning, and critical skill, produce any such question in all the old or new testament, Will the Lord be pleased, *tho' thou hast no other Gods but him?* That thou *makest not to thy self any graven image, &c.*? That thou *honourest thy father, or mother, &c.*? Or, in other words, (which according to our Saviour is the sense and substance of the ten commandments) *that thou love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and mind, and strength, and thy neighbour as thy self?* So far from this, that our Saviour taxeth the pharisees with abominable hypocrisy, for making this an excuse for not helping their father, or mother, that what should relieve them was devoted to some pious uses that were requir'd by the ceremonial law, *Mark vii. 9, 10. &c.* The scripture is every where full against Mr. H—t. And it plainly shews the great mischief of an *extravagant fondness* for our own *fancies*, when a man doth not see, what is so very plain, *viz. that to obey is better than sacrifice, and to hearken than the fat of rams.*

But what words can express the mischeivous tendency of such a *fondness* for our own *idle whims*? When a man, to support his extravagant notions, shall say as Mr. H—t doth, *p. 158,* ' That it was accidental, and owing to
' the complaints and remonstrances of the peo-
' ple, that the ten commandments were di-
' stinguish'd from the rest, and that if the peo-
' ple had complain'd, when only five com-
' mands had been deliver'd, God would have
' desisted from speaking, when the five were
' pronounc'd, and that if the people had born
' the terror longer, he would have proceeded
' to publish *twelve, fourteen, or any other num-*

' ber in the same manner, and deliver'd all
 ' his commandments to them in the same
 ' manner, by a voice from heaven, and that
 ' the distinction was made by the People.
 How *daring* is it to tell what God would have
 done, or not have done, when he himself hath
 told us no such thing? This author might
 with as much reason have told us, that if the
 people had remonstrated, and told *Moses* they
 could not bear it, (when they saw the moun-
 tain burning with fire, and cover'd with dark-
 ness, clouds, and thick darkness, and knew,
 that God was about to deliver his law) God
 would have spoken nothing at all: But there
 is reason to think, that if the people had
 clamour'd never so much, God would not
 have forbore to deliver the laws he did with
 an audible voice: For God tells *Moses*, *Exod.*
xix. 9. That he would come to him in a thick cloud,
that the people might hear when he spake to him,
and believe him for ever. And that the people
 might be fit to attend to what God was a-
 bout to say, *Moses* was commanded to *sanctify*
them, &c. v. 10. We may therefore very well
 believe, that it was God's design to deliver
 neither more or fewer commands than he did
 and this seems to be very clear from *Deut.*
iv. 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14. Only take heed to
thy self, and keep thy soul diligently, lest thou
forget the things that thine eyes have seen, and lest
they depart from thy heart all the days of thy life,
but teach them thy sons, and thy son's sons: speci-
ally the day that thou stoodest before the Lord
thy God in Horeb, when the Lord said unto me, ga-
ther me the people together, and I will make them
hear my words, that they may learn to fear me all
the days that they shall live upon the earth, and that
they

they may teach their children: and ye came near and stood under the mountain, and the mountain burnt with fire unto the midst of heaven, with darkness, clouds, and thick darkness. And the Lord spake unto you out of the midst of the fire: Ye heard the voice of the words, but saw no similitude, only ye heard a voice. And he declared unto you his covenant, which he commanded you to perform, even ten commandments; and he wrote them upon two tables of stone. And the Lord commanded me at that time, to teach you statutes and judgments, that ye might do them in the land whither ye go over to possess it.

Much to the same purpose, we have Moses telling the Jews, after he had rehears'd to them the ten commandments, Deut. v. 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28. These words the Lord spake unto all your assembly in the mount out of the midst of the fire, of the cloud, and of the thick darkness, and he added no more, and he wrote them on two tables of stone, and deliver'd them unto me, &c. And 'twas not 'till after this, 'till the laws were spoken and written by God, and all spoken and written that God intended to speak and write, that the people, and the heads of their tribes, and all the elders came unto him, and desir'd, that what God had farther to declare he would declare by Moses. This makes it clear, that the distinction was not made by the people; nor doth God ever intimate, that he design'd to deliver the whole law with an audible voice. He deliver'd as many laws as he intended at first to deliver. What he deliver'd, and afterwards wrote on tables prepar'd by himself before on purpose, was to prove the people, and to make them obedient. And therefore, if he had been stopt (as Mr. H—t supposeth he might
at

at any time) by the cries and clamours of the people, it would not have answer'd his intention of gathering them together : nor wou'd one or two, or five commandments, have fill'd the tables that God had prepar'd. And had God gone on, the tables wou'd not have contain'd them. So that all that Mr. H—t offers in these five pages, is no other than a *bold fiction* of his own *fancy*, which he tho't might some way serve his turn in setting aside the ten commandments. He can't therefore reasonably expect, that what he says without any shew of *proof*, and with such a degree of *boldness*, concerning God, and his designs, (as I scarce ever met with) shou'd be regarded as any other, than so many *daring* and *rash conjectures*, which every modest and sober person shou'd be asham'd of.

Mr. H—t, I think, is also very much mistaken in saying, p. 161. ' That the arguments ' which prove, that christians are not oblig'd ' to obey the *Mosaic law* in general, do necessarily prove, they are not bound by the ' ten commandments in particular.' For there's this vast difference between laws *moral* and *ceremonial*, that the one sort bind all persons, and can never cease to bind, and that the other can bind no other sort of persons, nor for any longer time, than the *great and sovereign legislator* that gives them, intends they shall. God having therefore signify'd it as his pleasure, that the ceremonial law, which was a *schoolmaster to bring persons to Christ*, shou'd cease when Christ came, and that Christ's disciples shou'd not be under this schoolmaster, which was perfectly unnecessary ; this is abundantly sufficient to prove, that we are not under the ceremonial

ceremonial law. This is repeal'd, or rather the design of it is fully answer'd: But the moral law will admit of no such repeal. This is represented as *perpetual*, and *immutable as heaven and earth*; a phrase which signifies, that their obligation wou'd never cease, but that they would continue to be a standing rule to the church of God. And what a flaming reproach wou'd it be to Christ, and his religion, if they were not? However, Mr. H—t is pleas'd to say, that there are several arguments that prove the ten commandments in particular don't oblige christians.

His first argument is, p. 161. ' Here he argues from the preface, with which they are introduc'd; I am the Lord thy God, who have brought thee out of the land of *Egypt*, out of the house of bondage. From hence, he says, 'tis plain, that they who were oblig'd to obey the ten commandments were the *Jews*, whom God deliver'd out of *Egypt*, and their posterity; and therefore if we can't prove that we are some of their posterity, we can't prove that we are laid under any obligation to obey the ten commandments, unless as he adds, p. 162, God hath publish'd these commandments a 2d time, with a new preface directed to other people.' But is Mr. H—t so weak as to imagine, that these laws wou'd not have been binding without such a preface? 'Twas, I allow, a very great obligation on the *Jews* to be observant of these laws, that God had wrought out such a surprising salvation for them; and it would have been most notoriously ungrateful if they had not regulated their conduct by these laws: But had they never been favour'd with such a deliverance,

deliverance, they wou'd yet have been bound to obey them, from the equity, and reasonableness, and *intrinsic* goodness of the laws themselves, and the favours they might promise themselves, if they were thus obedient. This, I allow, was one, but 'twas not the only reason why they ought to be obedient: For farther, there is something in the preface that doth concern other people as well as the Jews, and carries a perpetual and the strongest obligation in it to be obedient; and that is, that he was the Lord *their* God. Now, this same God, who was the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, was the God of all *Flesh*. The Apostle stiles him, *Rom. iii. 29, 30. the God of the Jews and Gentiles*; and says, that it was one and the same God that should justify both. The Apostle knew nothing of a late author's whim, which 'tis probable may be Mr. H—t's too, that the Jews had one tutelar God, and the Grecians another, and the Romans another, &c. The Apostle's opinion was, that that God who deliver'd the law, (and was very probably our Saviour, God manifest in the flesh afterwards) was God over all, and blessed for evermore. And this perhaps may be a secret reason with Mr. H—t, why he hath taken such exception against the ten commandments, that that God who deliver'd them was, according to him, the God of the Jews only before his resurrection, and that therefore they can't be obligatory on christians.

If it was not for some such reason as this, 'tis much Mr. H—t should overlook a reason in the preface, which must be of much greater weight with the Jews than their bare deliverance out of *Aegypt*. 'Tis a reason that will
ever

ever be in force, and that with all persons, whether *Jews* or *Gentiles*, viz. that they ought to obey the voice of the Lord their God. If this God is pleas'd to lay any farther particular obligations on his people, besides the right that he hath to their obedience, as God their *creator*, *preserver*, and *benefactor*, 'tis an additional motive to obedience: But a law doth not lose its obliging force, tho' there be no such motive. Besides, there is not one of these laws but the *Jews* were oblig'd to obey before ever they came out of *Egypt*, and these laws were publish'd in such a solemn tremendous manner. Their deliverance from *Egypt* (which was attended with so much miracle and mercy) shou'd, I own, have prevail'd with them to pay a stricter regard to these laws, and so indeed shou'd all the mercies that men receive; and especially that greatest of mercies that the *Jews* expected, and we enjoy, viz. our surprising deliverance by Christ Jesus: But still God hath an *indefeasible* right to mens obedience, whether he lays them under such obligations or no. 'Tis obligation sufficient, that he is the *Lord our God*. This was the most important part of the preface, and is still in force; and therefore this argument can't serve Mr. H—t's purpose; nor cou'd he himself have tho't so, if he had not carelessly overlook'd the Apostle's exhortation; and the place where this is written, and from which the Apostle takes it; I. *Pet.* i. 15, 16. compar'd with *Leviticus* xi. 45, *For I am the Lord that bringeth you up out of the Land of Egypt to be your God; ye shall therefore be holy, for I am holy.* Here the Preface to the ten commandments is us'd: But this was no objection with the Apostle, tho' it be with Mr. H—t. The

M

Apostle

Apostle exhorts those to whom he wrote to be *holy in all manner of conversation, because it is written, Be ye holy, for I am holy.* 'Twas written to the *Jews*, and enforc'd with what is offer'd in the preface to the ten commandments, and yet the Apostle tho't it oblig'd christians, so that, I have the satisfaction to agree with the Apostle, tho' I happen to differ with Mr. *H—t*.

And as there is nothing in what Mr. *H—t* calls his *first argument*, so what he calls his *second*, p. 162. is as little to his purpose. This is taken from the promise in the 5th commandment. It shews indeed a good inclination to serve a cause, when a man brings such arguments as he hath to support it, whether good or otherwise: But Mr. *H—t* should have remember'd, that his business was to prove that the ten commandments don't oblige christians; but it falls out very unlucky, that he should mention a commandment as repeal'd, when the very commandment (to use a phrase of Mr. *Baxter's* about the commandments) is recited *perceptively*, and urg'd upon christians as a *rule of life*, and with a promise annex'd to it for its better observance. With what face can Mr. *H—t* say, that this law doth concern none besides the *Jews*, in a direct contradiction to the apostle? who plainly shews, that it was intended to oblige the *Ephesians*, and in them, (as Dr. *Towerson* speaks) because they were *Gentiles*, all other christians. Nor are our *translators* to be blam'd for rendering this promise as they do; for *to live long on the earth*, or be long-liv'd on the earth, is a strict grammatical rendering of *μακροχρόνιον ἐν τῇ γῆ*, and it seems plain, that the Apostle did designedly leave out these words *which the Lord thy God gi-*
veth

with thee, because he was writing to the *Gentiles*, who never had, nor were ever to have, such a concern with the land of *Canaan* as the *Jews* had: But he urgeth the commandment upon them in the very words, that God gave it to the *Jews*, which sufficiently shews, that tho' first given to them, it is yet binding on christians. And he adds so much of the promise as was pertinent to his purpose, to shew to the *Gentiles*, (as Dr. *Whitby* on the place observes) that God, who is not the God of the *Jews* only, but also of the *Gentiles*, is ready to reward moral duties performed by them, as well as by the *Jews*; and as to those Children, that (under God) do honour and obey their parents, they may promise themselves more prosperity on earth than disobedient children can have reason to do. This second argument therefore, instead of serving Mr. *H—t's* turn, is directly against him.

Mr. *H—t's* third argument, p. 165. to prove that the ten commandments don't oblige christians, he takes from *Deut.* iv. 8, 10, 14. And if Mr. *H—t* had only said, that the ten commandments were primarily given to the *Jews*, who were then the only church of God in the world, and that they were eminently favour'd in this respect that the oracles of God were committed to them, that they were the first that had the benefit of a divine adoption, and the glory, and the covenants, and the giving of the law; and the service of God, and the promises, that theirs were the fathers, and that of them, as concerning the flesh Christ came, who is over all God blessed for ever. Amen; this would have been no more than the Apostle hath said, *Rom.* ix. 4, 5. And I can't think that any would have

opposed Mr. H—t, if he had gone no farther. The Jews, it must be allow'd, were a highly favour'd People. God *knew them of all the families of the earth.* 'Twas unto them *first* that God having raised up his Son Jesus, sent him to bless them, by turning of them from their iniquities : But will it follow as a consequence from hence, that the law and the promises of Christ shou'd always be confin'd to them ? All that the text brought by Mr. H—t proves, is, that the Jews had many *distinguishing privileges* : But how doth this prove, that none were to share in these privileges, when the church should extend its bounds beyond *Palestine* ? According to the predictions of their own Prophets, *all nations were to flow in unto it.* And the great end of this was, *that they might be taught God's ways, and be brought to walk in his paths,* which glorious event was to be brought about by the law's going forth out of Sion, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem, *Isaiah ii. 2, 3.* Here it was that the *moral law* had a new promulgation by Christ and his Apostles. And after Christ's ascension it had the like promulgation in other parts of the World ; so that contrary to what Mr. H—t advanceth, it was made known to the *Gentiles*, as well as the *Jews*; and this is an evidence (according to Mr. H—t's own argument) that the *Gentiles* were concern'd in it.

God was pleas'd before, in the course of his providence, to make way for the more extensive reception of this his law, by dispersing the Jews before the coming of Christ into many parts of the world; as also, by raising up some to translate the old testament into *Greek*, which was then the most common and fashionable

ble language of the gentile world. By these and the like steps it pleased God to prepare the way for the more universal knowledge and reception of his law: But so inveterate is Mr. H—t against the ten commandments, that p. 166. in answer to a suppos'd objection that might be made, *viz.* that the *Gentiles* may now be bound to obey the ten commandments, since they are taken into the same church with the *Jews*, and since the ten commandments have been promulgated to all men by the gospel, he hath these remarkable and *very shocking words*. ' I answer, the new testament ' is so far from obliging christians to obey the ' ten commandments, that it frequently declares they are abolish'd, and cease to be ' a rule to the church of God.' I am even surpriz'd to think, what *extravagancies of expression* an *ill grounded opinion* will run some men into ; and if I am not mistaken in calling Mr. H—t so, I would willingly be inform'd, where it is that the new testament hath any such declaration, or any thing like it. Nay, is not this to fly, as it were in the face of, and to give the lie to our Saviour himself? who says expressly, that *he came not to destroy the law; i. e.* as is evident from the context, *the moral law, but to fulfil it, Mat. v. 17.* which words A-Bp. Tillotson very judiciously expounds thus, * ' That Christ was not come to *dissolve*, and ' *abrogate*, and *make void* the law, or to encourage men to to the Breach of it. That the ' precepts of his religion were in no wise contrary to the law and the prophets, did not ' thwart and oppose them, or any ways contra-

' dict

* Tillotson's Posthum. Works, Off. Vol. 4. P. 88, 89.

'dict the main design and intention of the law
 'and the prophets, that is, of the Jewish religion.
 'I am not come to destroy, but to fulfil, i. e. to carry
 'on the same design that was intended by the
 'Jewish religion, and to perfect and accom-
 'plish it; to supply all the defects and weak-
 'nesses and imperfections of that dispensation.
 'This, he says, is the plain meaning of this cau-
 'tion and declaration of our Saviours', *Think*
 '*not, &c.*' And that by the law and the prophets
 (which our Saviour said, *he did not come to de-*
stroy) must be principally, if not solely, meant the
moral law, will appear to any one, who shall
 attentively consider the scope of his discourse:
 For, as the great and judicious person just
 mention'd observes, † his whole discourse is
 about precepts and obligations of the *moral*
law, and not a word concerning the *ritual* and
ceremonial law. The great things that Christ
 recommends in this chapter are works of piety,
humility, meekness, mercy, &c. and concerning
 that system of laws, or the ten commandments,
 that oblige to these works, our Saviour says,
 that *'till heaven and earth shall pass away, one*
 jot, or one tittle, shall in no wise pass from the law
'till all be fulfilled. This could not be meant of
 the *ceremonial law*, which was to last no longer
 at farthest than 'till the time of our Saviour's
 death; but it is to be understood of these laws
 which the pharisees had corrupted, and made
 void by their traditions, which was the *moral law*,
 or the law of the *ten commandments*. 'Tis of
 these laws, (as our Saviour himself explains
 it afterwards) that did forbid *murder, adultery,*
perjury,

† Tillot, *ibid.* p. 100.

perjury, revenging of injuries, &c. that Christ says he did not come to destroy them.

These laws are so far from being abolish'd, and ceasing to be a rule to the church of God, that by our Saviour's putting such an honour upon them, as he hath, by his expounding and recommending them, we are under much stronger obligations to observe them then ever we were. And this is perfectly agreeable to what Mr. Baxter says, (whom I should hardly have mention'd, unless Mr. H——t had pretended that he neither said nor meant more than this great and good man) Mr. Baxter's words are, 'that the ten commandments, except the preface, a word or two in the second commandment, and the determination of the seventh day in the fourth Commandment, are the common laws of nature, which is not done away by Christ, but made a part of his own laws. Farther, he says, that Christ hath expressly made them his law by reciting them preceptively, and so they bind all christians now, as the law of nature, and the law of Christ.' * Is not this directly contrary to Mr. H——t's assertion, that they cease to be a rule to the church of God, and that the scripture frequently declares they are abolish'd? Farther, Mr. Baxter says of these laws, † 'That neither the words, nor the sense of these laws that were written on the tables of stone, were alter'd by Christ.' 'Twould be endless to mention all that Mr. Baxter says in his *paraphrase* on *Mat. v. 17; 18,*
19.

* Mr. Baxter's *Annotations* on the 3d Chap. of II. Corin.
† *Method. Theol. pars tert. p. 162.*

19, 20: and other places, in his *Methodus Theologiae*, where he expounds the ten commandments as other *protestant divines* have done, and in other of his works, to shew, that the ten commandments are still in force, and still a rule to the church of God. So that Mr. H—t (the better, I suppose, to skreen himself from the just censures of serious christians) hath notoriously abus'd this good man, in making him say as he doth, that they cease to be a rule to the church of God, when yet Mr. Baxter says directly the contrary, and only says, 'That they don't bind us formally, i. e. consider'd as a material part of that national covenant that was between God and the Jews, or as a condemning law.' In which sense I don't know of any one that says they do bind. Is not this then a most false and flaming reproach upon the memory of an excellent person? But Mr. H—t hath been pleas'd to cancel the obliging force of all the commandments, and therefore 'tis less to be wonder'd at that he hath made so free with the *ninth*.

But to make it still farther evident, that the new testament hath never once declar'd (which Mr. H—t saith it doth frequently) that the ten commandments are abolish'd, and cease to be a rule to the church of God, I would observe, that it is very unreasonable to imagine, that our Saviour would ever attempt to cancel the obligation of a law which in its own nature is *unalterable*, and is besides so admirably adapted to promote the great ends of his coming into the world. Can it be tho't, that our Saviour, who came to redeem us from all iniquity, and to purify us unto himself a peculiar people zealous of good works, shou'd shew the least dislike

N

concerning the ten commandments, *viz.* that they are his laws, and still in force as a rule of life, and that we must be sincerely conformable to them, if we wou'd inherit eternal life.

But if any shou'd still suggest, that our Saviour here only declar'd what the law requir'd, and not what he himself requir'd ; I answer, that this is notoriously to wrest our Saviour's words ; for he doth not say, thus it wou'd have been under your *own dispensation*, but *now* it is otherwise ; but *this do, and thou shalt live*. And, farther still, there is another passage to which no such unreasonable exception can be made ; and that is, *Mat. xix. 16, &c.* compar'd with *Mark x. 17, &c.* and *Luke xviii. 18, &c.* Here we have the question put by a *young man* (who by comparing the Evangelists seems to be a ruler among the *Jews*) what good thing he shou'd do that he might inherit eternal life ? To which our Saviour gives him this plain answer, *that if he wou'd enter into life, he must keep the commandments*, that is (as is evident by a particular enumeration of all the commandments of the second table) the commandments that were deliver'd by *Moses*, and which *Mr. H—* says are now abolish'd, and cease to be a rule to the church of God. These commandments our Saviour says he must comply with, if he wou'd be happy ; to which answer, when the young man reply'd, *that he had kept all these commandments from his youth*, he ask'd our Saviour farther, whether any thing more was necessary ? To which our Saviour answers, *that if he wou'd be perfect, he shou'd go and sell all that he had and give to the poor, and then come and follow him*, by which our Saviour plainly intimated to him, that if he

he did this, and persisted in his former course of obedience to the laws of God, it wou'd be an undeniable proof of his sincere love to God and men, qualify him to be a member of his *kingdom on earth*, and also of his *more glorious kingdom in heaven*.

From this passage, I think, 'tis undeniably plain, that we can't be the followers of Christ, unless we obey these very commandments that were first deliver'd to the *Jews*. Our Saviour, 'tis evident, hath adopted them to be the laws of his kingdom. But if any still object, that there is no mention made of the laws of the *first table*, I answer, with Mr. *Baxter*, that the person, who did put the question to our blessed Saviour, is suppos'd to confess God, and consequently his duty to him. And moreover, our Saviour, by requiring him to sell all that he had, did in effect require him to observe the commandments of the *first table*. And had he comply'd with this advice, this would have been a most substantial proof, that he *lov'd the Lord his God with all his heart, &c.* which is the *summary* of the commandments of the *first table*. Besides, can any think, that our Saviour (tho' he only reckons up the commandments of the *second table*) could ever intend to exclude those of the first? And farther, did he not know, that our obedience to the laws of the *second table* must flow from a principle of love to God, which is the substance of the *first*, if ever it gives us a title to eternal life? To which I add, upon this answer of our Saviour to the young man, that if the ten commandments did not oblige the disciples of Christ, and if obedience to them was not the way to eternal life, and a proper and necessary

means to obtain that end, it would be one of the worst reflections upon our Saviour, for who can imagine, as Dr. *Whitby* says, * that
 ' when men came seriously to enquire of him
 ' the way to eternal life, he would deceive
 ' them, by directing them a way that he well
 ' knew was not sufficient to obtain that end ?'
 To which I add, who can imagine that he would direct to a way that he himself had block'd up ? as he must, if it be true what Mr. *H—t* says, viz. that the ten commandments are abolish'd, and cease to be a rule to the Church of God.

Upon the whole, I take it to be utterly impossible to reconcile Mr. *H—t*'s *libertine* and *unaccountable expressions* with our Saviour's direction to this young man, and many other passages of sacred scripture ; and really there could not well be a greater temptation to men to despise the religion of our blessed Saviour, and to make it to be his'd out of the world, than to represent it as that which hath reversed the ten commandments, which God can no sooner abolish than he can the relation between himself and his creatures, and all the rules of virtue and vice, right and wrong. If the ten commandments be nothing to christians, we may as well say, 'tis nothing to them, to love the Lord their God with all their heart &c. that it is nothing to them, to transgress that golden rule, *Mat. vii. 12.* Therefore all things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them : For this, as our Saviour says, is the law and the prophets. What must Mr. *H—t* make of

of our Saviour and his religion, if all this be abolish'd, and ceaseth to be a rule to the christian World?

Mr. H—t's 4th argument, p. 166, 167. to prove, that the ten commandments don't oblige christians, is this: ' That the Apostles
' were not ministers of the ten commandments,
' that they were not ministers to promulgate
' the ten commandments to the world, and
' to call mankind to obey them, and that
' therefore it can't be thought that they do
' oblige christians. ' This argument, I allow, must carry a great deal of weight, if there was any foundation in scripture for such assertions: But Mr. H—t must have been a very careless reader of his bible, if he hath not observ'd, that the apostles do very frequently call upon christians to obey those very laws which he says do not oblige them. Did St. Paul therefore go beyond his commission, when he thus wrote to the Romans, Rom. xiii. 8. &c. Owe no man any thing, but to love one another; he that loveth another hath fulfilled the law; for this, thou shalt not commit adultery, thou shalt not kill, thou shalt not steal, thou shalt not bear false witness, thou shalt not covet; and if there be any other commandment, it is briefly comprehended in this saying, namely, thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself; love worketh no ill to his Neighbour, therefore love is the fulfilling of the law. 'Tis true, the Apostle doth not mention in this place the fifth commandment: But then he urgeth the observation of this in another place, viz. Ephes. vi. 1. St. Paul then, 'tis clear, was a minister of the commandments of the second table; and that those of the first table are not mention'd also, may be, because what the apostle doth principally urge in this chapter, did

did not so naturally lead him to speak of the commandments of this table. However, the note of *Esthins* upon this place is not contemptible, namely, that a true love to our neighbour is the fulfilling of the law, as it respects our duty to God; because he that loves his neighbour aright, loves him for God, and in obedience to him. But if there should be nothing material in this remark, it can't, I think, with any reason be deny'd, that if St. Paul was a minister of the commandments of the *second table*, as is abundantly clear from the above passages, he was also a minister of the commandments of the *first*: Nor can we in the least doubt, but what he chargeth upon Timothy was in his own commission, *viz.* to let all persons know, that the great design of the gospel was the very same with that of the law, which was to promote love to God and men. *The end of the commandment is love, out of a pure heart, and a good conscience, and of faith unfeigned.* This Paul and Timothy were to teach, I. Tim. i. 5. i. e. the two great commandments, which, according to our Saviour's own determination, are a *compendium* of all the ten commandments.

Farther, the apostle speaking of the commandments, I. Tim. i. 8. says, as he had to the *Romans*, Rom. vii. 12. *that the law was good*, and that we might know, what this law was that he pronounceth good, and was now, even by Mr. H—t's own acknowledgment, p. 173. a part of the glorious gospel of the blessed God that was committed to his trust, he enumerates several offences condemn'd by the ten commandments; by which 'tis plain he had his eye upon the *moral law* contain'd in the

the ten commandments, for the *ungodly*, as Dr. *Whitby* on the place observes, ' were sinners against the first commandment. The *sinners* here spoken of were the sinners of the *Gentiles*, or idolaters, according to the title they have, *Gal. ii. 15.* and were transgressors of the second commandment, *perjured persons* of the third, the *unholy and profane* of the fourth, the *murderers of fathers and mothers* of the fifth, the *manslayers* of the sixth, the *fornicators and defilers of themselves with mankind* of the seventh, *man-stealers* of the eighth, *liars* of the ninth,' These were some of the sins that *Paul* and *Timothy* were to preach against, and the duties that were enjoin'd by the same ten commandments, and contrary to these sins, they were to urge. So that here is one apostle appointed to be a minister of the ten commandments, all which he doth in effect enumerate, except one, in this place, and this also he doth urge, *ch. vi. 8.* as also, *Heb. xiii. 5.* where it is observable, that contrary, to what *Mr. H—t* hath advanced, *p. 177.* he brings an *old testament promise*, made to *Joshua*, to enforce it upon christians. *St. Paul* then was a minister of the ten commandments. 'Twas a part of his *commission* to press the duties enjoin'd by them, and to dissuade from the sins forbidden in them; and if this was a part of the *commission* of him, who by way of eminency, was the *Apostle of the Gentiles*, we can't but believe, that all the other apostles had the same *commission*; and accordingly we find, that they were all commission'd to go and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, teaching them to observe all things which *Christ* had commanded

commanded them, part of which was, that if they would enter into life, they must keep the commandments. And therefore, not only St. Paul, but St. James also, speaks most honourably of these laws, calling them a royal law, and a law of liberty, and a law that we ought not to transgress wilfully in one point, lest we be guilty of all; which is as much as if St. James, like St. Paul, had enumerated all the commandments, as he doth the sixth and seventh, James ii. 8, 10, 11.

In this then, the religion of the old, and new testament do perfectly agree. Both require obedience to the ten commandments, which were indeed all in force before Moses's time, and can't but be in force, as long as there is any religion in the world, that is worthy of God. St. Paul declares his abhorrence of making void the law in this sense, viz. as a rule of life. Do we then make void the law through faith? Yea, we establish the law. As a rule of life, it hath all the force that ever it had, Rom. iii. 31. When therefore the Apostle speaks of it as a letter that killeth, as in Mr. H—r's fourth argument, as the ministry of death and condemnation, as in his fifth and sixth arguments, and as a school-master to bring us to Christ, as in his seventh, the meaning is not, that the ten commandments are no longer a rule of life to christians. In this sense the law is establish'd; nor was it ever the design of the christian dispensation to take away the obliging force of the moral law: But then the gospel dispensation hath so much the advantage of the legal or Jewish dispensation, that, upon a comparison with the former, it may very justly be call'd a ministration of the letter, and the gospel a ministration of the spirit. It

It may also be call'd a *ministration of death and condemnation*, and the gospel a *ministration of righteousness*. That these are but *comparative speeches*, to shew the excellency of the *gospel dispensation* above the *legal*, we learn from the Apostle, II. Cor. iii. 10. *For even that which was made glorious had no glory by reason of the glory that excelleth.*

Under the *legal dispensation*, which is call'd a *letter*, and sometimes a *dead letter*, God was pleas'd to reveal his will concerning man's duty; but did not so plainly discover his *grace*, in pardoning men their omissions of duty, and doing acts contrary to their duty, or assisting men to the performance of their duty. This *letter* therefore is said to *kill*, because it sheweth men their duty, accuseth, condemneth, and denounceth the wrath of God against men: But it giveth no strength, *i. e.* comparatively, for the doing of it: *But the spirit giveth life*; that is, the *gospel* doth not only shew men their duty, as the *law* did, and revoke these carnal ordinances that were in force under the *law*, but offereth men more powerful and effectual assistances of the *Holy Ghost*, to discharge their duty; and, on this account, may well be call'd as it is, ver. 8. the *ministration of the spirit*. We have a more *spiritual religion*, and more encouraging assurances of divine aids and influences, to make us good, than they had whilst the *legal dispensation* lasted.

Another advantage that the *gospel dispensation* hath above the *legal* is, that whereas the *legal* is call'd a *ministration of death and condemnation*, this is a *ministration of righteousness*. The rigorous sanction of the *law* was, *Cursed is every one that continueth not in all things that are written in*
 O the

the book of the law, to do them. And tho' persons might be justified under the *legal dispensation*, notwithstanding this rigorous sanction, which did rather concern the *Jews* in their *political* and *national*, than in their *personal capacity*, yet God's method of justifying sinners was much more obscurely reveal'd then than it is now. We have now the fullest and strongest assurances, that if we have a *faith in Christ that worketh by love*, and disposeth us to keep the *commandments of God*, we shall never come into condemnation; *that if we have our fruit unto holiness, the end shall be everlasting life.* This method of justification was witnessed to, as the Apostle says, *Rom. iii. 21. by the law and the prophets.* In which expression the Apostle, 'tis likely, may refer to *Genesis xv. 16. Isaiah liii. 11. Dan. ix. 24.* But the revelation of this was so dark and obscure in comparison of what it is now, that many of the *Jews* did not see, nor cou'd any of them so well see, *that Christ is the end of the law, for righteousness to every one that believeth, Rom. x. 4.* 'Tis now written as with a *sun-beam* that we are justify'd freely by God's grace through the redemption that there is in *Christ Jesus, Rom. iii. 24.* This veil then is done away. The law itself contain'd in ordinances, or divers rites, purifications and washings, is done away. There are no *Priests* or *Levites*; there is no *worldly sanctuary*, nor any ministrations in it, or relations to it. † Also, the darkness of the *Jewish dispensation* is now done away. We are under a better and much brighter dispensation than the *Jews* were. We are not kept

† *Pool's Annot. on Cor. iii. 11.*

kept in the dark by *types, shadows, and prophecies*, as the *Jews* were. *We may now behold as in a glass the glory of the Lord.* The gospel gives us a full and clear representation of the grace of God that is discover'd in the justification of penitent believing sinners. 'Tis Mr. H—t's gross mistake to conclude, that the *ten commandments* don't oblige christians, because they are under the *evangelical*, not the *legal dispensation*. The Apostle neither says nor intimates any such thing. The *gospel* requires as strict, if not stricter, conformity to these same laws, than the *old dispensation* did: But then we have clearer and stronger encouragements to obey these laws than the *Jews* had.

'Tis therefore *the veil, as the Apostle speaks, that is done away in Christ*, II. Cor. iii. 14. So that if Mr. H—t had look'd to this 14th verse, when he quoted the 13th, he could not have said, that this is a testimony full and express; unless it be so, to shew that he hath grossly perverted the Apostle's meaning. All that the Apostle intends in this chapter is to shew, that christians have much the advantage of the *Jews*. The *ministration of the law was glorious*; but not so glorious as that of the *gospel*. There was a great deal of majesty and glory that did attend the giving of the law: But nothing so much as when *God was manifest in flesh*. This glory was full of *grace and truth*. By this we understand more thoroughly than the *Jews* could, that God is willing to assist, and willing to justify sinners. And 'tis upon this account that the *law and gospel* have such different titles. That the one is call'd the *letter*, and the other the *ministration of the spirit*. That the one is call'd the *ministration of death, and condemnation*,

and the other of *life and righteousness*. The darkness of the former is now past and gone, and the *true light now shineth*. We have the same moral laws to govern our conduct by that the *Jews* had: But yet are under a much better, because a much clearer, dispensation than the *Jews* were, and a dispensation that requireth very little more than faith in Christ, and keeping the commandments of the moral law.

As to that which Mr. H—t calls his seventh argument, 'tis too trifling to take much notice of it. For, besides that 'tis a *blunder* to refer us to *Terence*, a *Latin author*, to understand the just signification of a *Greek word*, yet if *Terence's* explication of the word *παιδαγωγος* was right, as it is plain from the next verse, and I. Cor. iv. 15. it is not, (where it plainly signifies one that hath the care and instruction of children committed to him) I can't tell what Mr. H—t would get by it: For all that we can gather from the passage, *Gal. iii. 24, 25*, is, that we are not under the legal dispensation; that we are not justified by the works of the law; but are the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus, as the Apostle explains himself, ver. 25, 26. 'Twas out of regard to Christ that was to come, and suffer, that persons were justified under the law. 'Twas to Abraham and his seed that the promises were made, and particularly that very glorious one that all the nations of the earth should be blessed in his seed, i. e. as the Apostle explains it, in Christ Jesus. However, the *Jews* generally thought of no other way of justification, but by the works of the law: But it is evident now, beyond all exception, that this is not the method of our justification. 'Tis by believing in Christ that we must be justified. And
this

this persons might easily have learnt from the legal dispensation itself. This the Apostle calls a *school-master*, whose proper business it is to fit children for higher degrees of learning, as at *universities*, &c. 'Twas to this end that the law serv'd, *viz.* to fit persons for a *nobler dispensation* under Christ. The ceremonial law shew'd Christ in all his types and sacrifices. And even the moral law shew'd the absolute need of a mediator, as it shew'd them sin, accused and condemn'd them for it, and as it shew'd them no clear help, either for the guilt of sin contracted, or against the power of it: But to infer hence, as Mr. H—r doth, that the *ten commandments* don't oblige to duty, is a *wild inference*, and quite besides the Apostle's design. We are still under the moral law, as a *rule of duty*, but not as a *school-master*. We don't now want the help of the law to shew us our need of Christ. Christ is now fully reveal'd as the great object of saving faith: But even now we can't hope, that *Christ should be the author of eternal salvation, unless we are obedient*, and take care particularly to obey the *ten commandments*.

What Mr. H—r calls his eighth argument, p. 169, 170, one would think, is added for no other reason than to swell the number of what he calls his arguments. For 'tis evident that the *dispute* between *Jews* and *Gentiles*, mention'd *Acts xv.* was not, whether they ought to worship one God, or many; whether they ought still to worship their old idols; whether they ought to abstain from perjury, and

¶ *vid.* *Peck's Annot. on Gal.* iii. 24, 25, 26.

and profane swearing, or not; whether they ought to have a certain fix'd time for the worship of God, or not; whether they ought to honour their Parents, or not; whether they ought to abstain from murder, adultery, theft, false-witness, coveting what was their neighbour's, or not. They were entirely agreed as to these things. And the christians of *Antioch* must have been a very odd sort of christians, if they had pleaded an exemption from these laws that required such duties, and forbid such sins, as the *ten commandments* did. They had no exception against any of these laws, nor pleaded for any sin condemn'd by them, after they became christians, unless we may except *fornication*, which the *Gentiles* generally held to be indifferent; tho', at the same time, they punish'd *adultery*, (which was the sin forbidden by the letter of the law) with the utmost severity. There are some who think, that as *fornication* is here plac'd among those things that are in their own Natures indifferent, so we are to understand no more thereby than marrying within some of those degrees that were prohibited among the *Jews*, but never scrupled among the *Gentiles*. But let this be as it will, we may yet believe this, that if the *gentile christians* had pleaded any exemption by the christian religion from the observation of the *ten commandments*, St. Paul would never have been their *patron* and *apologist*; because he himself had it in his commission to teach the observation of them, and acted accordingly, *Rom. xiii. 8, 9, 10. I. Tim. i. 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11.* The dispute therefore between the *gentile* and some of the *judaizing christians* was, whether the *gentile christians* ought to be circumcised,

circumcised, and thereby be oblig'd to keep the ceremonial law, which requir'd gifts and sacrifices, several sorts of meats and drinks, divers washings, and carnal ordinances, as the expressions are, *Heb. ix. 9, 10.*

These ceremonies (as the Apostle observes in the passage just mention'd) were never design'd to continue but 'till the times of reformation by Christ; and yet, as *St. James* says, *Acts xxi. 20.* there were many thousands that believ'd, who were zealous sticklers for these laws. And therefore, to prevent all offence and clamour, he adviseth *St. Paul*, who had been among the gentiles, and was represented as an enemy to all the laws of *Moses*, to take with him four men that were under a vow, and purify himself with them, and be at charges with them, that thereby these zealots might be convinc'd that he walked orderly, and kept the law, *i. e.* these ceremonial laws, *Acts xxi. 23, 24, 25.* And, to prevent all objection, *St. James* tells him, that this compliance of his for peace sake cou'd not affect the gentiles; because they had written, and concluded, that they observe no such thing, *i. e.* as is plain, no such ceremonies. There was no occasion to mention the ten commandments, because *St. Paul* taught them, and the gentiles made no objections against them, and 'twould have been wild and unreasonable, if they had. So that what *Mr. H—t* says is perfectly groundless, *viz.* 'That if the ten commandments had been to be excepted, the Apostles wou'd have excepted them.' There was no dispute about them, unless any will except the second and seventh about meats offer'd to idols, and fornication. And these, if they shou'd be intended, are both establish'd and confirm'd by

an

an apostolical decree. The Apostles don't want to be told by Mr. H—t what they shou'd put into their decree. The decree was according to the nature of the *question*, or *complaint*, that was brought before them: Nor were the Apostles so impertinent as to make the additions that Mr. H—t seems to think they ought to have made about the *ten commandments*. These were out of the *question*; and therefore it wou'd not have been like the Apostles (who were men of sense, as well as under inspiration) in determining about a *question* that did come before them, to determine about a *matter* that did not.

As little to the purpose is what Mr. H—t offers under this that he calls his 8th argument about the 4th commandment. *The gentile christians* had no objection against observing the seventh part of time as holy to the Lord. 'Tis what they had done in their *heathen state*. And 'tis common in their writings to give the seventh part of time the title of *ισαθρ̃ ημερα*, or holy day: And much less would the *gentile christians* object against that particular seventh part of time which they knew was of greatest account with the Apostles, because it was that very seventh part of time that was had in the highest veneration by themselves, before there was any such thing as christianity in the world. They were wonderfully pleas'd, no doubt, that the Apostles manifested a distinguishing regard to that very day which they themselves esteem'd above all others. Farther, the contention between the *Judaizing zealots*, and the *Gentile christians*, as I have already observ'd, was about *Mosaical ceremonies*: But as to the *substance* of the fourth commandment, 'twas in force about

bout two thousand years before *Moses's* time. There was a *sabbath*, or a seventh part of time, observ'd as holy in all ages from the beginning of the world. So that the law concerning the *sabbath* can't so properly be reckon'd among *Moses's laws*; and much less among *Mosaical ceremonies*. But of this I hope to give a fuller and more distinct account in a little time. 'Tis a sufficient answer to what Mr. H—t hath advanc'd to say, that the 4th commandment, as well as the other of the ten commandments (except as before excepted) was out of the *question* that was brought before the apostles to decide; and that it becomes Mr. H——t to be a little more modest than to dictate to the apostles what *decrees* to make, or how to word them.

There is nothing in the *decree* as made by the apostles themselves no, nor yet in *reason* or *scripture*, that could give Mr. H—t any just occasion to say, as p. 171. that the apostles declare, that the gentiles are to observe nothing in the law of *Moses* besides the *four rules of abstaining from blood, from things strangled, from meats offer'd to idols, and fornication*. Mr. H—t hath boldly declar'd it for them; but where doth he meet with such a declaration? What, were not the gentiles requir'd to love the Lord their God, &c. and their neighbours as themselves? Were they not requir'd to abstain from polytheism, idolatry, murder, adultery, theft, &c.? What a liberty would Mr. H—t establish for gentile christians? A liberty indeed highly pleasing to corrupt nature: But surely 'tis of too odd a complexion to be that wherewith Christ hath made us free; and really 'tis surprizing to me, that when *Judaism* and *Christianity* did both come

from God, that they shou'd be made so irreconcilable, (as they are by Mr. H—t) in every part with each other.

I can easily allow, that *Jewish ceremonial laws* don't oblige, and must think, that, if by *fornication*, in *Acts xv.* may be understood (as some expositors think) marrying within some of those degrees that were prohibited among the *Jews*, then these restrictions that were laid upon the gentile christians were chiefly design'd to prevent their giving offence to the *converted Jews*, and to cultivate brotherly love between them and the *gentile christians*; and they are call'd necessary, not because they are *absolutely necessary* to salvation, or simply and in their own nature necessary, but necessary only at that time, and necessary for the peace of the church, 'till the *Jews* shou'd better understand their christian liberty, *i. e.* if *fornication* may be understood as above: But if it can't signify this, but we are to understand thereby that *heinous sin* that is commonly understood thereby, then this is *absolutely necessary*, and a restriction that doth always bind, tho' the others do not. As to the three other things that were call'd necessary then, they are not necessary now, unless, when it may answer such a valuable and important end as it did then: But that the *moral laws* of the *Jewish* religion shou'd be abolish'd as well as the *ceremonial laws*, is what I cou'd never understand; and I believe, that Mr. H—t with all his skill can never prove, that God intended to abolish them, or that it is consistent with the *divine perfections*, or the *eternal reasons of things*, that they should be abolish'd.

What

What Mr. H—t says, p. 172. about the observation of the *Lords-day* I readily assent to; but yet must add, that if the *fourth commandment* be taken away, it must very much weaken the obligation that I think christians are under to observe that day as sacred that now they do. It is call'd, I allow, the *Lords-day*; and it is mark'd out by the practice of the apostles as such; but that the seventh part of time, after six days labour, shou'd be holy to the Lord, this derives its obligation more immediately from the fourth commandment, which is a law reviv'd, and the same for substance with that *original institution*, Gen. ii. 2, 3. And as to those who plead from either, or both of these Passages, for the observation of the *Jewish sabbath*, let them answer for themselves. All that I plead for is a strict and holy observation of the seventh part of time; and what particular day that must be, the apostles practice, who knew the mind of their great master, who was *Lord of the Sabbath*, is, I reckon, sufficient to specify.

Mr. H—t's ninth argument is taken from Heb. xii. 18, 19, 22, 24. but if any will be at the trouble to look into that passage, they must immediately be satisfied, that all that the apostle intends by the comparison there made between the *law* and the *gospel*, is to let us see, how great and distinguishing our privileges are, by being under the *christian dispensation*; that under this we have greater helps, motives, and encouragements, to act well, and pursue happiness, than the *Jews* had under the *legal dispensation*. This we ought to acknowledge with all thankfulness: But to infer thence, as Mr. H—t doth, that the ten

commandments are no part of that *new covenant*, of which Jesus is the *mediator*, is an *extravagant inference*; for may'nt the *evangelical* be better than the *legal dispensation*, tho' the laws of both be the same? 'Tis sufficient to shew, that the *evangelical* hath the preference, (tho' the moral duties requir'd by both are the same) that it contains more full, clear, and express promises of assistance, acceptance, and eternal life; and 'tis on the account of these, and the like promises, and because after Christ had offer'd himself a sacrifice, there was no farther offering for sin, that Christ is said to be the *mediator of a better covenant*, *Heb. viii. 6, &c. Heb. x. 14, &c.* compar'd. If the ten commandments, according to Mr. H—t, were no part of the covenant of which Christ is the *mediator*, instead of being better, it wou'd be much worse, and give *deists* and others very just occasion to insult christianity, as a *doctrine of libertinism*, unworthy of God, and deserving to be abhorr'd by men: But if any shou'd thus reproach *reveal'd religion*, and especially the religion of Jesus, tho' Mr. H—t may, yet neither the prophets, nor apostles have given them the least occasion to do so. The prophet *Jeremy* (in speaking of that covenant, that God intended to establish in gospel times, and which is the gracious covenant we are now under, as may be seen by comparing *Jer. xxxi. 31, &c.* with *Heb. viii. 8, 9, &c.*) says, *This is the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel. After those days, saith the Lord, I will put my law into their inward parts, and write it in their hearts, &c.* That same law that God wrote in *tables of Stone* before he wou'd now write it in their hearts, which makes a vast difference

ference in the dispensations. 'Twas undoubtedly this moral law that both the prophet and apostle had their eye upon, and which Mr. H—t says, in a plain defiance to both, is no part of the gospel covenant: But 'tis evident that 'tis so essential a part of the new covenant, that if it be not writ upon our hearts by the spirit of God, and we don't keep and fulfil the righteousness thereof, we can never be justified and saved, *Rom. ii. 26, 27.*

And whereas Mr. H—t says, p. 173. of these commandments contemptuously enough, 'that there is no foundation for calling the ten commandments by way of eminency the moral law, and that they are like any other set of the *Mosaic* laws, moral and ceremonial laws are mingled together.' this I take to be very *dogmatical*, when there is nothing like reason to support it. In opposition to this confidence of Mr. H—t, I might offer the wiser and more modest sentiments of the fathers, who were unanimously of opinion, as Dr. *Whitby* says, * that God gave the Jews only the decalogue, or moral law, 'till they had made the molten calf, and that afterwards he laid the yoke of ceremonies upon them, to restrain them from idolatry. And not only the fathers, but also all modern divines of any note do say much the same. But if this be not sufficient, I should be glad to be inform'd what these ceremonial precepts are. The fourth commandment, (which is the only one I can think carries the appearance of ceremonial in it) as to the substance of it, I have shewn not to be
so,

* *Whitby's* Annot. on *Gal. iii. 19.*

so, and that this law can't so properly be call'd a law of *Moses*; but if it be, there is but a very small part that is ceremonial: But as to the other commandments, there is nothing like ceremonial in them; and if only a small part of this, *viz.* that about the seventh part of time be ceremonial, or more properly *positive*, this is not enough to make up these ceremonial precepts that, Mr. H——t says, are in the ten commandments.

Thus I have consider'd very particularly what Mr. H——t says about the ten commandments, and can't, upon the whole, but be shock'd, that he should in the close of a discourse that hath not the least countenance from reason or scripture, discourage parents from teaching these commandments to their children, and tell us, 'that he perswaded Mr. P——ce to leave them out of what he calls 'his excellent catechism; and that he was inclin'd well enough to do it, if the omission of them would not have rais'd an unquerable prejudice against his whole catechism.' I wonder Mr. H——t would fasten such a blot upon the memory of his good friend Mr. P——ce, as to make him deliver that as obliging to christians, that he did not think to be so. If it be justifiable in him, or any other person, to deliver those things as true, and a matter of duty, that they don't think to be so, to avoid a popular prejudice, why may'nt they as well impose upon mankind in other instances? Whymaynt' they be *papists*, tho' they deliver *protestant doctrines*? or *deists*, tho' they plead for *revelation*? At this rate a man may be a *beathan* in *China*, a *mahometan* at *Constantinople*, a *papist* at *Rome*, and a *protestant* at *London*. Mr. H——t (if what he says of Mr. P——ce be true) hath

hath represented him as a true disciple of *old Hobbes*, with whom it was a principle, that 'twas no matter what men told the world, provided they held the truth firmly in their hearts. But where's the *honesty*, or *sincerity* of such a conduct? And who (after such a character given of Mr. *P—ce*, by Mr. *H—t*,) can be at any certainty whether he believ'd any thing that he deliver'd to his people, or the world, or no? Or who can know what he believ'd, or what not? Mr. *P—ce*, according to Mr. *H—t*'s representation, would have the world believe, that he thought the commandments to be binding on christians: But, it seems, he believed no such thing. Mayn't he therefore deceive the world in other instances as well as this? Mr. *H—t* perhaps hath not that regard to men, that Mr. *P—ce* had. If he had, he must either think very meanly of his own people, and that they were sunk very much in their regards to *vertue*, or else that they had his own person in a very *fond admiration*, if it did not raise some resentments in them, to observe these very laws so openly and boldly insulted, by which, as St. *James* says, *they must be judged at the last day*: But if Mr. *H—t* hath no regard to men, 'tis much he should not be under some fear of God, whose commandments the *ten* are, and also commandments writ with his *own finger*, and order'd to be put into the *ark*, to shew his distinguishing regard to them: 'Tis much, I say, that he should not be afraid to treat these commandments with so much contempt, on which God hath put so great an honour, which our *Saviour* explain'd, and recommended to the observation of all his disciples, under this very *awful consideration*, that

if

if they would enter into life they should keep the commandments. This, methinks, should convince Mr. H---r, that 'tis of the last importance to teach them to children, and that it must be of vast advantage to them, if they are taught them, as Christ taught them to his disciples, *Mat. ch. 5th, 6th, 7th.* God forbid that I should speak a word against teaching children all the precepts of the gospel. I can be sure, I have too high a veneration for them, to think or speak meanly of the *least* of them: But yet I should tremble to speak, as Mr H---r doth, p. 173. Instead of the first commandment, I should choose that of the gospel, *Turn from these vanities unto the living God:* Instead of the second I should choose, *Neither be ye idolaters, as were some of them:* Instead of the third, I should choose, *The law is made for perjured persons, &c.* For, besides that there seems much too great an air of arrogance in this way of speaking, what Mr. H---r puts in the room of the first is nothing so easy to be understood as the *first commandment* itself; nor what he puts in the room of the second so plain and explicate as the second *commandment* itself. But thus it often happens, that wise men blunder, when they think they are crickets enough to correct what God himself doth. They are both, I allow, the commandments of God; and both should stand.

Remarks on Mr. H---r's ninth discourse; wherein some very great defects in Mr. P---ce's catechism, and Mr. H---r's method of catechising, are laid open.

AS to Mr. P---ce's catechism, I might not perhaps have meddled with it now, if
Mr.

Mr. H---t had not so highly extoll'd it, calling it, p. 173. an excellent *scripture-catechism*: But, before I consider whether this catechism doth answer the character that Mr. P---ce himself gives of it in his preface, and Mr. H---t after him in his 9th chapter of discourses and observations, I shall make a few remarks on the *specimen* that Mr. H---t hath presented the world with of his exposition of some of this *wonderful catechism*, which he says had the happiness of being approv'd by Mr. P---ce. And here I might very justly take notice how foreign many of Mr. H---t's questions in his *specimen* are to the purpose of that scripture he attempts to explain, and what a tendency such a foreign method hath to lead persons into a misunderstanding of the scriptures. By this method, I allow, (as Mr. H---t says, p. 181.) we may take occasion to bring in any thing that relates to *divinity*; but when things are brought in thus *awkwardly*, that are nothing to the text that we are to explain, such a method is likely to do a great deal of mischief; for, tho' it may raise admiration in the ignorant, that a passage of scripture shou'd afford such uncommon things as did not seem at all to be deducible from it, (and that really cou'd not be deduc'd from it according to any rules of *criticism*, and *true reasoning*) yet the scriptures must by this means be greatly debas'd, because wrested from their proper meaning: And besides, when the scriptures are thus tortur'd and made to speak any thing, that either *wild* or *fanciful men* are willing they shou'd speak, 'tis too probable, that *ill-designing men* will take the advantage of it, and endeavour to persuade the world, that the scriptures which

Q

are

are thus made to signify and speak every thing, do mean nothing. Mr. H---t himself hath, I think, sufficiently expos'd his own method, and greatly abus'd his catechumens,

What a dangerous tendency must it have to encourage his catechumens to say, as p. 177. that the commands of the old testament were peculiarly given to the *Jews*? And that the promises of the old testament were peculiarly made to the *Jews*? And, to say in effect afterwards, in pursuance of these very odd and false assertions, 'That the old testament is of no other use to christians, than that they may here read the descriptions of God's attributes, the histories of his providence, the prophecies, the examples of piety, and the accounts of God's judgments on sinners,' is not this to teach his catechumens, and now the world, to slight all the other parts of the old testament, particularly those doctrines that relate to the *creation* of the world, the *creation* and *apostacy* of our first parents, the early and very gracious encouragement that God gave to man after his apostacy concerning his pardon and salvation? Is not this to teach children, that they have no concern with those laws that require us to fear, and love, to worship, and trust in God; nor with any of those promises and threatnings that shou'd excite and quicken us to these duties? Mr. H---t, I think, must be much wanting to his *younger charge*, to tell them that they have no concern with that very useful precept, or direction, or any other of the like nature with that, *Ecclesi. xii. 1. Remember now thy creator in the days of thy youth.*

St

St. Paul, I am sure, must have very different apprehensions from what Mr. H—t hath of the old testament, or he would never have commended, or instructed *Timothy* as he doth, *II. Tim. iii. 15, 16, 17, From a child thou hast known the holy scriptures, which are able to make thee wise unto salvation through faith that is in Christ Jesus. All scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, &c.* The scriptures here referr'd to are evidently those of the old testament. These are the scriptures that *Timothy* had known from his youth; for those of the new testament were not then written. Those scriptures, he says, were able to make him wise unto salvation. Those scriptures were profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness, &c. i. e. from those scriptures they were to learn what doctrines they were to believe, and what errors to avoid; what vices they were to abstain from, and what ways of righteousness they were to walk in. The scriptures of the old testament were, as he says, so profitable for all these important purposes, as to be sufficient to make the man of God perfect; provided, as he says, ver. 15. there be faith in Christ Jesus. By which passage the apostle joins the scriptures of the old testament, and the doctrine of the gospel together as having the same tendency, and harmoniously conspiring to promote the same end, namely, man's eternal salvation. And this all ministers must teach their people, if they would act faithfully, and not tell them, as Mr. H—t doth, that christians have no concern with the laws, promises and threatnings of the old testament.

Q 2

But

But if this, with what I have said on Mr. H—t's 8th chapter, should not be thought sufficient, as I flatter myself it will, I will add one thing more, which must put it beyond all doubt that christians ought to observe the laws of the old testament, and that is what the apostle offers from it, from *Rom. xii.* as matter of duty to all christians; thus, ver. 9. *Avoid that which is evil, cleave so that which is good,* is taken from *Amos, v. 15*: Ver. 16. *Be not wise in your own conceit,* is taken from *Prov. iii. 7.* where the words in the *septuagint* and the *new testament* do differ only in this, that this law, or rule of practice, in the old testament is deliver'd in the *singular*, and in the new in the *plural number*. Ver. 19. *Dearly beloved avenge not your selves, but rather give place unto wrath, for it is written, Vengeance is mine, or belongeth to me,* as it is, *Heb. x. 30.* Here tho' the law, or exhortation itself be not; yet the reason why we should obey it, is taken from *Deuter. xxxii. 35.* Ver. 20. *If thine enemy hunger, feed him, if he thirst give him drink, for in so doing thou shalt heap coals of fire on his head.* Here both the law and the reason for observing it are taken, word for word, from *Prov. xxv. 22.* I might mention other laws taken from the old testament, and enforce'd in the new, as that, *Acts xxiii. 5.* taken from *Exod. xxii. 28.* &c. But these instances that I have brought, without any others that might easily be brought, are abundantly sufficient to shew, that the laws of the old testament were not peculiarly given to the *Jews*; and if this won't satisfy Mr. H—t, I despair of giving him satisfaction. But I can't shut up this without saying, that 'tis very shocking, and of the worst tendency, that christians should be told, that they have no concern

Concern with all those admirably wise and wholesome directions, that we have for *piety* and *devotion*, for *justice* and *charity*, &c. which we particularly meet with in the *Psalms*, *Proverbs*, *Ecclesiastes*, the *Prophets*, and other parts of the old testament.

Mr. H— hath as little reason to teach his *catechumens*, that the promises of the old testament are peculiarly made to the *Jews*. To make which evident, I would observe, that 'tis the general opinion of interpreters, that that passage, *Gen. iii. 15.* contains in it a promise of Christ. And if this be true, which I can see no reason to question, 'tis evident, that all the posterity of *Adam*, whether *Jews* or *Gentiles*, had a very near and most important concern in it. But if this should be disputed, that promise can't that God made to *Abraham*, as the father of the faithful, whether *Jews* or *Gentiles*, *Gen. xxii. 18.* And in thy seed shall all the nations of the Earth be blessed. *St. Peter* tells the *Jews*, *Acts iii. 25.* that they were concern'd in this promise: And *St. Paul* acquaints the *Galatians*, and in them all the gentile world, that they were as nearly concern'd as the *Jews* were in the same promise, *Gal. iii. 6, 7, 8, 9.* &c. God looks upon all sincere believers, whether *Jews* or *Gentiles*, as the children of *Abraham*, and the apostle expressly says, That the promise that God made to him was sure to all the seed, not to that only which is of the law, but to that also which is of the faith of *Abraham*, who is the father of the *us* all *Rom. iv. 16.* There are a great many promises in the old testament, which do evidently extend to all good men. Of this kind are those very gracious promises that we have, *Isa. lv. 3, 7.* Incline your ears and
come

come unto me, hear, and your souls shall live, and I will make an everlasting covenant with you, even the sure mercies of David. 'Tis plain, from the 4th and 5th verses, that the gentiles had a concern, as well as the Jews, in these sure mercies; and it is clearer still from the application of these words to the cases of all, after the wall of partition between Jews and Gentiles was broken down, *Acts* xiii. 34, 38, 39, 42.

What follows in the 7th verse of this 55th of *Isaiah* was made for the comfort and encouragement of all; *Let the wicked forsake his way, and the unrighteous man his thoughts, &c. and I will have mercy upon him, and abundantly pardon him.* 'Twould be endless to reckon up all these promises of the old testament that relate to the pardon of penitent offenders, of direction to those that trust in God, of God's favour to those that are obedient, of God's hearing the prayers of those that are upright, of his giving eternal life to those that are good, &c. I'll content myself to refer the reader to a very large catalogue of them, collected to his hand, at the end of the revd. Mr. Sam. Clark's annotations on the bible. There are great numbers of the promises here mention'd that are no more peculiar to the Jews than they are to other good men: But they are written for the encouragement of virtue and goodness in all into whose hands those sacred revelations should fall. 'Tis to these old testament promises that Mr. H—t is pleas'd to stir, and teach his catechumens to despise, that the apostle doth refer, *II. Cor.* vii. 1, compar'd with chap. vi. 16, 17, 18, *Having therefore these promises (dearly beloved) let us cleanse ourselves from all filthiness of flesh and spirit, &c.* According to Mr. H—t, it must be impertinent

impertinent in the apostle to urge christians to so important a duty with promises that they had no concern in.

This same apostle, or whoever was the author of the epistle to the *Hebrews*, doth, ch. xiii. 5. urge christians to avoid *covetousness*, and exercise contentment from an old testament promise made by God upon several occasions, first to *Jacob*, *Gen.* xxviii. 15. afterwards repeated by *Moses* to *Joshua*, *Deut.* xxxi. 8. next repeated to *Joshua* by God himself, *Josh.* i. 5. next offered to *Solomon* by his father *David*, *I. Chron.* xxviii. 20. and last of all urg'd by the apostle, as above, upon all christians. This makes it abundantly clear, that christians are concern'd in the promises of the old testament. But to put the matter out of all doubt, our blessed Saviour himself, in his most excellent sermon on the mount, *Mat.* v. is pleas'd, in several of his *beatitudes*, to refer to the old testament, and to offer that for the encouragement of his disciples in all ages which was first offer'd to the *Jews* for their encouragement. Thus, when Christ promised to those *that mourn, that they should be comforted*, he plainly refers to *Isa.* lxi. 2. Thus, when he assures the *meek, that they shall inherit the earth*, he takes the promise from *Psalms* xxxvii. 11. Thus, when he tells those who *hunger and thirst after righteousness, that they shall be filled*, and that those who are *pure in heart shall see God*, he hath evidently a regard to those promises which we have to the same purpose, *Isa.* lv. and beginning, *Psal.* xxiv. 3, 4, 5. Thus, I think, I have said enough to satisfy the world and convince Mr. *H—t*, that neither the *laws*, or *promises* of the old testament were peculiar
to

to the *Jews*; and can't but observe, upon the whole, that if his other performances upon the *catechism* are no better than the *specimen* that he hath laid before the world, his *catechumens* will need another *catechist*, before they'll be able to understand the grounds either of *natural* or *reveal'd religion*; which yet, by his extraordinary method, he thinks children that are ten or twelve years old, and some much younger, may be brought to do, p. 182.

I pass by the very unbecoming reflection Mr. H—t teacheth his *catechumens* to make on the *things hard to be understood* in St. Paul's epistles, p. 180. being satisfy'd, that, whatever Mr. H—t says, the generality of christians will believe, that St. Paul hath deliver'd nothing in his epistles but what is highly useful. Besides, I might observe, that (if Mr. H—t will allow of our present reading, which he doth not except against in this place) 'tis not of St. Paul's epistles that St. Peter speaks, when he says, *in which are some things hard to be understood*; because *ἐν τῷ*, being of the neuter gender, cannot agree with *ἐπιστολαίς*, which is of the feminine; but if we shou'd read it *ἐν αὐτῇ*, as it is in some copies, and so allow it to belong to St. Paul's epistles, Mr. H—t hath still put his *catechumens* upon giving an impertinent instance of persons wrestling the *hard things* in St. Paul's epistles; because the instance given is nothing to the subject that St. Peter was upon, which related to the coming of the day of Christ. There were many that wrested what St. Paul had said before, and St. Peter in his second epistle, concerning the day of Christ; II. Thes. ii. 2. II. Peter. iii. 3, 4, 5, 9. But Mr. H—t, to shew
his

his wonderful skill in catechising, puts an instance into his pupils mouths as wide from *St. Peter's* purpose as any he cou'd well have tho't of. I wish therefore Mr. H---t may be a little more cautious in his other performances, or else his people will be in danger of wrestling not only the hard, but the plainest things in the sacred scriptures.

But to make a remark or two on Mr. P---ce's *catechism*, which Mr. H---t says, p. 175. 'That it teacheth children to reason, to believe nothing without proof, to see with their own eyes, to guard them against seducers, and to establish them in an unshaken regard to the doctrines and commands of the gospel, to acquaint them with the meaning of words, with true notions, and to make them sensible what evidence there is for the great truths of the christian religion:'. Mr. H---t having given this catechism this *lofty character*, the world must believe that he hath in effect made it his own; and so is answerable for all the defects and mistakes of it; especially seeing he doth not only teach it to the children that are under his own care, but commends it to the world without any exception, and consequently as that which doth teach all the principles of *revealed religion*, as that which hath not omitted any first necessary principle of religion, or by the questions given any wrong turn to any of the texts, as in the preface, p. 1. I can sincerely assure Mr. H---t I have no objection against this catechism because the answers are in *scripture expressions*. I'll venture to say, that no one hath a higher veneration for the oracles of God, as deliver'd in the old and new testament, than I have. I know no other

ther rule of faith and manners. However, I know, that those very scriptures, which are so peculiarly profitable, for direction, for reproof, for corrections, for instruction in righteousness, may be wrested, not only by unlearn'd and unstable men, to their own great damage and that of religion (St. Peter says, to their own destruction), but also by men of parts and learning; and none are so likely to wrest them as these, especially if they are proud and conceited, according to that known saying of Luther, *religio nunquam*, &c. Religion is never in greater danger of being corrupted, than by those that are men of parts and learning. And this is abundantly evident from this applauded catechism; for tho' the answers in it consist of scripture-expressions, and so can't be objected against, yet the questions are so contrived, as that several things that are of great importance in religion are left out; and the answers delivered without any explication, but what may be gather'd from the artful contrivance of the questions.

This catechism therefore, so much extoll'd, (if we except those wrong and hurtful ideas that are convey'd in the questions concerning several things that are of great moment in religion) is calculated rather for the benefit of the memory, than to inform the Judgment, concerning the mind of God in those many scriptures that are heap'd together. I can't therefore but think, that the assembly's catechism, or one drawn up according to this model, with proper scripture proofs, (tho' this, take it altogether, is the best I ever saw) will answer the end of catechising to vastly greater advantage than Mr. P—ce's can. To shew the difference only in one instance, (which is of the

the last importance in religion) tho' I might do it in a vast number. The instance shall be that of repentance, which hath more explication allow'd it than a great many others. This is allow'd by Mr. P—ce to be necessary to salvation; and this shews, of what moment it is to have true notions of it: But all that is said in Mr. P—ce's catechism to help us to such a notion is taken from *Acts* xxvi. 20. *That they should repent and turn to God, and do works meet for repentance.* Must not this leave persons in the dark still what repentance is? Does this at all explain to us what these works are? Doth this give us that full and clear account that God hath given us of this great and necessary duty in other places of scripture, and which are so judiciously brought together by the assembly of divines in their answer to the 87th question of their catechism, which runs thus, *Repentance unto life is a saving grace, whereby a sinner, out of a true sense of his sin, and the apprehension of the mercy of God in Christ, doth, with grief and hatred of his sin, turn from it unto God, with full purpose of and endeavours after new obedience?* The bare mentioning of those two accounts of that great and necessary work of a sinner's repentance is sufficient to shew, without any comment, where the advantage lies. The one collects those many rays of divine light that are scatter'd up and down in the sacred scriptures, and brings them into one view, for the reader's full and profitable information; the other leaves us in generals, and in the dark, without any distinct and satisfactory notion of that repentance that is necessary to salvation. And I would leave it to the world, and even to Mr. H—t himself, whether this be

not a likely way to promote *ignorance* ? And what is *worse* in the church of Christ, when the same method is taken in this catechism in other important points as well as this ?

But this is not the only defect in Mr. P—ce's *catechism* ; for he omits several things that I can't but think to be of great moment, and opposeth others that I can't but take to be of the last importance in *revealed religion*. 'Tis, I think, a very great and hurtful omission to take no notice of the *covenant* made with man, either in his state of *innocence* or his *fallen state*. 'Tis, I think, a very dangerous omission to take so slight a notice of our *misery by nature*, and none at all of our *original sin*. The scripture hath much to this purpose ; that we are by *nature children of wrath* ; that we were *shapen in iniquity*, and *concern'd in sin* ; that we have a *carnal mind that is enmity against God* ; that we are in such an unhappy condition by nature, that if we are not *born again* we cannot see the *kingdom of God*. But these things so requisite and useful (not to say necessary) to be known, are past over in silence ; and I wish it mayn't be with a design (tho' I fear it is) to throw a *vail* over our *great obligations* to our blessed Saviour, who came to rescue us from our deplorable circumstances.

But that which should stir up the abhorrence of all christians against such a *catechism*, is, that it attempts to rob our *Saviour* and *Sanctifier* of their highest glory, and will allow none but the Father to be truly and properly God, or the one God, *p. 3*. But thus to speak of our Saviour, as if he had not the nature and perfections of the one true God, is to oppose not only one first principle only, but to overturn the
the

the greatest part of christianity, that depends upon it and consequently; a great many first principles, as well as this one. To make which evident, let us consider how our Saviour is spoken of in scripture. And here 'tis allow'd by those who oppose his true and proper *Godhead*, that he is represented as the true *Messiah*, that was prophesied of, and promised to the *Jews*; nor have they yet ventur'd to deny, that 'tis necessary to believe that he is so. Farther, they allow, that he is represented in scripture as the *Son of God*, and the *only begotten Son of God*; nor have they yet openly presum'd to say, that 'tis not necessary to believe in him as such. Farther, they also allow, that he is the *Saviour of the world*, and that it is necessary to own that he is such. Farther also, they own, that he sustains the offices of *prophet*, *priest*, and *king*, and that he will hereafter be the *judge of the world*. And tho' they never car'd to speak so freely upon the head of Christ's being represented as the *great object of religious worship and adoration*, but have shamefully quibbled, and kept upon the reserve as to this important affair, in which the *conduct of christians* is so highly and nearly concern'd, yet many of them seem willing that the world should believe, that they are the *worshippers of Christ Jesus*, tho' this *celebrated catechism* seems to be entirely silent upon this head. But is it not surprizing, that when the scriptures speak so much concerning the worship of Christ in the strictest and most proper sense, that this *famous catechism* shou'd say nothing about it?

The best account that I can give of this *great and very dangerous omission* is, that if they should

should plainly own, that Christ ought to be worshipp'd with *divine* or *religious* worship, that then the charge of idolatry would hang as a dead weight upon their darling principle, viz. their denial of his true and proper Godhead: But then, by avoiding this inconveniency, they fall into another that is equally great; and that is, they don't honour the Son as they do the Father, which yet is the great and indispensable duty of every christian, John v. 23. yea, so much the duty of christians, that none can reasonably pretend to be christians without it. Remarkable to this purpose are the words of *Wolzenogenius* the *Soci-nian* upon this text as quoted by Dr. *Whitby*. * Tho' he was one that deny'd the proper godhead of our blessed Saviour, as Mr. H— and Mr. P—ce do, yet by this text of scripture he was forc'd to own, ' that he was equal to ' the Father, and that we are oblig'd to pay ' him that obedience, honour, and worship, ' that is due to a divine and heavenly king.' For says he farther, ' that the honour and wor- ' ship due to Christ is divine honour, is evi- ' dent from this, that it is such, *qualis patri de- ' betur*, as is due to the Father; to whom, by ' the consent of all men, belongs divine wor- ' ship.' And hence he proves, as Dr. *Whitby* says, that Christ is to be worshipp'd with invo- cation, ' Because he who refuseth to pray to ' him doth not honour him as he doth the Fa- ' ther. In this, says he, consists the highest ho- ' nour we give to the father, that we own him ' for the chief monarch and lord of all things, ' in whose power is our salvation and destru- ' ction,

* *Whitby's* Annot. on John v. 23.

tion; and therefore by prayer endeavour to
obtain from him the enjoyment of good
things, and the deliverance from evil. He
that owns these things to belong to Christ,
and doth thus worship him, he honoureth
the Son as he doth the Father.

'Tis not my business to reconcile this author
to himself; nay, this, I think, is impossible:
But if in this sense, we are to honour the Son,
as we do the Father, (as 'tis evident we are) how
is it possible that he should be any other than
the living and true God? Can he, says Dr.
Whitby, † be equal to God, who is only a
Creature, or be worthy of divine worship
who is no God? the precept being plain,
and own'd by Christ himself, *The Lord thy God*
is one Lord, and therefore thou shalt worship him,
and him only shalt thou serve? *Deut. vi. 13. Mat.*
iv. 10. Can he who said, *Thou shalt worship*
no other God but me, and I will not give my glory
to another, *Isaiah xlii. 8.* himself appoint,
that any creature should be worshipped as
God, or have that honour, worship, and o-
bedience, in which his glory doth consist?
It is therefore no unjust imputation, says he,
to call them idolaters, to give this worship to
one, who say they is by nature only man,
(or as I wou'd add, as others say, an angel, or
a created subordinate being, which makes no dif-
ference in the case) seeing they do the very
thing charg'd on the heathen idolaters, i. e.
they worship them which by nature are no Gods,
Gal. iv. 8. and do that to a creature which
God requires to be done to himself, viz. that
they

† Whitby ibid.

' they shou'd glorify him as God, Rom. i. 21. and
 ' do that which God upbraided his own peo-
 ' ple with, viz. they worship a new God, which
 ' their own fathers had not known. Deut. xxxii. 17.
 ' If you say here, says the Doctor, they give
 ' him the same worship, but not as the first,
 ' but only as the immediate cause of our sal-
 ' vation, it may, says he, be easily reply'd, that
 ' then they can't honour him as they honour the
 ' Father, and much less as the chief monarch
 ' and lord of all things. Moreover, says he, I
 ' enquire, whether this middle cause be created
 ' or uncreated. If uncreated, he is by nature
 ' God, (and since there is but one God) of the
 ' same essence with the Father: But, if cre-
 ' ated, they must be guilty of idolatry who
 ' give him the same worship with the Father,
 ' and therefore give the creature the worship
 ' due to the creator.'

Nor can it be any security against idolatry that
 we are commanded to honour the Son as we do
 the Father: For the command itself supposeth
 that he is truly and properly God. 'Tis not sup-
 posable, that God can by any command ob-
 lige us to worship creatures, when he hath given
 so many cautions and commands against all
 creature-worship whatsoever. And to say, that
 God can command us to worship creatures is
 in effect to say, that he could have commanded
 the heathens to worship as they did, and that
 their worship was no otherwise sinful than that
 they paid it to their gods without a command;
 that idolatry, one of the greatest of Sins, and
 the sum total of all absurdities, as an ingenious au-
 thor calls it, was not *malum in se*, but *malum*
prohibitum, and that only in some instances.
 'Tis in effect to say, that God might have com-
 manded

manded his creatures (if he had thought fit) to worship *four-footed beasts and creeping things*, and to fall down not only to the *boss of heaven*, but to the *stock of a tree*. But will any venture to say, that God can give forth such commands, or thus give his glory to another? That he can repeal his own commands, *Thou shalt have no other Gods but me; thou shalt not make to thy self, &c.*? Mayn't we with the same reason say, that God can oblige us to do other things, that are most *absurd, unreasonable, and vile*? But could we ever think, that if we had such a *religion*, a religion so inconsistent in itself, so contrary to all *reason and natural religion*, that it was a *religion* that came from God? I don't see how any can think, that any religion can have God for its author that doth not secure the honour of God, and that is not entirely free from the charge and encouragement of *idolatry*, which no religion can possibly be that shall command and encourage creature-worship. From this 'tis very plain, that our notions of Christ do very nearly affect our worship, which ought to be reckon'd as one of the *vital and substantial parts of religion*. If Christ hath the *perfections of the divine nature*, he may and ought to be worshipp'd; but if not, he can only merit the *respect* that is due to an *extraordinary creature*, but not *religious worship*. This divine worship is what God can't command us to give, and is therefore that which we may not venture to pay to any creature, how exalted soever. Those therefore that deny the *Godhead* of our Saviour, can never get clear of the charge of *idolatry*, if they venture to pay him *religious worship*: For which reason, those that are in contrary sentiments ought to leave such

to God and their own consciences, but may not venture to *m.x* worship and communion with them, lest they become partakers of that great sin that they can't possibly acquit themselves of, if they worship Christ in a strict and proper sense.

But then if any refuse to pay Christ religious worship, I can't see how they can justly claim the character of christians. The known scripture character or periphrasis of such is, *those that call upon the name of the Lord*. Thus we have christians describ'd by *Ananias*, when sent by Christ to work a miracle upon *St. Paul*, *Acts ix. 13, 14. Lord, I have heard by many of this man, how much evil he hath done to thy saints in Jerusalem; and here he hath authority from the chief priests to bind all that call on thy name, i. e. all thy disciples*. 'Twas by this title, and their practice which was agreeable to it, that christians were distinguish'd from others, both by the apostles and their enemies. By the apostles: Thus *St. Paul* (who was before advis'd by *Ananias*, *Acts xxii. 16. to arise and be baptiz'd, calling upon the name of the Lord, even that Jesus who appear'd to him*, *Acts ix. 17.* and hereby shew that he was a christian) gives this title afterwards to all christians, *I. Cor. i. 1, 2, 3. Paul an apostle of Jesus Christ, &c. unto the church of God which is at Corinth, to them that are sanctified in Christ Jesus, called to be saints, with all that in every place call upon the name of the Lord, both theirs, and ours, grace be unto you, and peace from God our Father, and the Lord Jesus Christ*. In this last verse he owns the title, and in effect invokes both the Father and Jesus Christ, and that without any note of inequality, to bestow grace and peace upon them. We may observe, that christians have

have the same title, and are encourag'd to act according to it, *Rom. x. 13. Whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved.* In *Joel ii. 32.* from whence this passage is taken, the Lord there spoken of is *Jehovah*, which signifies the true and only God: And the apostle here (as is undeniable from the next verse) applies it to *Jesus Christ*; for says he, *How shall they call on him in whom they have not believed? And how shall they believe in him of whom they have not heard, &c. i. e. Jesus Christ,* concerning faith in whom he had been discoursing throughout the chapter. So that in scripture to believe in Christ, or to be a worshipper of Christ, are phrases of the like import and signification. And as Christians are distinguish'd by the apostles from other men by their being worshippers of Christ, so they were thus distinguish'd by their enemies, and own'd the title themselves. This is the title that the Jews gave *St. Paul* after his conversion, *Acts ix. 21. Is not this he (speaking of St. Paul, who was now become a believer) that destroy'd them that called on this name in Jerusalem, and came hither for that intent that he might bring them bound unto the chief priests?* And as they are thus describ'd by their enemies the Jews, so they were also thus distinguish'd by their heathen enemies: And accordingly *Pliny*, in his account of the first christians, which he sent to the emperor *Trajan*, acquaints him, that when they met together for religious worship, among other things, they sung an hymn to Christ, as God. And so full and frequent is history in giving an account of this matter, that it can't be deny'd, that the first christians were wont to pray to Christ, yea to entreat others to pray to him on their behalf. Thus

Ignatius desir'd the christians of *Rome* that they would pray to *Christ* for him, that by the beasts he might be found a sacrifice to *God*. And so the church of *Smyrna* saith, that they could not leave *Christ*, and worship and pray to any other. † And in this common and constant practice of theirs they were abundantly warranted by the practice of the apostles, and other inspir'd persons; for *St. Paul* doth not only pray to *Christ*, as well as the *Father*, for grace and peace in his thirteen first epistles, which also was the practice of *St. John*, II. epist. iii. *Revel.* i. 4, 5. where he also joins (as *St. Paul* had done before, II. *Cor.* xiii. 14.) the *Holy Ghost* with them, as one of the glorious and adorable fountains of these blessings: But, lest any should quibble here, and pretend that these are not prayers, but wishes, (tho' I believe 'twill be hard for them to tell the difference between a solemn wish and a prayer, where the blessings wish'd for must come immediately from *God*) there are other places where there is not the least room for such a groundless and trifling cavil. Of this nature is that passage, *Acts* i. 24, 25. *And they prayed and said, thou Lord, which knowest the hearts of all men, shew which of these two thou hast chosen, that he may take part of this ministry and apostleship.* Tho' *Dr. Clark* says, that it is ambiguous whether these words be directed to *Christ*, or *God the Father* yet he is forced to own, and, I think, even to the utter ruin of his vile hypothesis, * that seeing *Christ* did chuse the rest of the apostles, it seems * rather more natural to suppose the words directed

† *AQ. Polycarp.* apud *Usser.* p. 27.

' rected to him.' * And what the apostles did
 here in a body, and upon a very solemn and
 weighty occasion, the same we find was done
 by those that came after them. Thus St. Ste-
 phen, the *protomartyr*, makes a direct application
 to the Lord Jesus, *Lord Jesus receive my spirit,*
Lord lay not this sin to their charge, Acts vii. 59,
 60. Here we find, says Dr. *Whitby*, † ' Stephen
 ' full of the *Holy-Ghost*, calling religiously up-
 ' on *Christ* now in heaven, to receive his spirit,
 ' and thereby testifying not only that religious
 ' worship was due to him, but also that he
 ' could hear his prayer, and receive his spirit
 ' at that distance, and therefore was om-
 ' nipresent, and the searcher of the heart, and
 ' he in whose hands the spirits of men are.
 To which he might also have added, that he is
 here represented as one that forgives sins, which
none can do but God only. In like manner, St.
Paul, after his *conversion*, did the very same un-
 der his great distrels that St. Stephen did; tho'
 he and other *Jews* had persecuted him even un-
 to death, upon this very account. Thus, II.
Cor. xii. 8, 9, 10. *For this thing I besought the Lord*
thrice, that it might depart from me; and he said
unto me, &c. Dr. *Clark* here says as above, *
 that the word is ambiguous; but he must needs
 have known, that tho' there might be such an
 ambiguity in the word *Κύριον*, as us'd in some
 places of scripture; yet there was no ambigu-
 ity in it as us'd in this place, and therefore he
 owns, tho' very loth to do it, that it seems
 rather to be understood in this place of *Christ*.
 But

* Dr. *Clark's* Scripr. Doct. &c. p. 132. † Dr. *Whitby's*
 Annot. in Locum. * Dr. *Clark's* Scripr. Doct. &c. p. 136.

But 'tis plain from the the following verses that it can't be understood otherwise; and this and a great many other passages of scripture put it beyond all doubt, that as it was the title of christians that *they were those that call'd upon the name of the Lord*, so their practice was perfectly consonant thereto; they worshipp'd Christ, and thought themselves oblig'd so to do; and thus to honour the Son as they did the Father.

This makes it very clear to me what notions they entertain'd, and thought themselves oblig'd to entertain, concerning our *bless'd Saviour*, viz. *that he was God over all*, and the great object of religious worship. The apostles could not be ignorant of what our Saviour declar'd, namely, that God only is the object of religious adoration: *Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve*. The apostles knew that the angels were only their fellow servants, and ought not to be worshipp'd, Revel. xix. 10. That the Angels were all under an obligation, as well as they, to worship Christ, Heb. i. 6. They knew that God hath expressly condemn'd the worship of Angles, Col. ii. 18. and of all creatures whatsoever, Rom. i. 25. and that God looks upon all as guilty of notorious idolatry, who do service to that which by nature is no God, Gal. iv. 8. 'Tis most clear therefore to me, that if the apostles had thought our Saviour to be such, they would never have worshipp'd him at all, but disown'd the character of being those that call'd upon the name of the Lord. Respected him as a great and worthy person they might; but to make their solemn applications to him they would not. This they knew was peculiar and appropriated to God; and that God could never (in consistency

This
our S
believe
sins, J
Messiah
is anoi
is given
what v
thers,
anointe
them.

stency with the whole drift and tenour both of the Jewish and christian religion) have given forth any commands to this purpose. Upon the whole therefore, one of those two things must follow; that such can never come up to the christian character who don't pay Christ religious worship, and that none can pay him religious worship, unless he be the true God, without being guilty of the abominable sin of idolatry. So that it must be a matter of the nearest concern to christians to assert the Godhead of Jesus Christ. They forfeit their christian character, if they don't worship him; and if they do worship him, and yet deny his Godhead, they can't possibly vindicate their worship from idolatry, till they have overturn'd the Apostle's definition of this great and heinous sin, which consists in doing service to that which by nature is no God. But,

Father, it must be a matter of the last importance to christians to own the deity of our blessed Saviour, for that those who do not, do in effect deny him to be the Messiah, the Saviour and Judge of the world, as also that he is the son of God.

They do in effect deny that he is the Messiah. This article is so necessary to be believed, that our Saviour tells the Jews, that if they did not believe, that he was the Christ, they should die in their sins, John viii. 24. The proper signification of Messiah in the Hebrew, and *Xristos* in the Greek, is anointed. And this name Messiah, or Christ, is given to our blessed Saviour, in allusion to what was customary among the Jews, and others, whose prophets, priests, and kings, were anointed, before they took these offices upon them. As man, and mediator, our Saviour had

had a sort of anointing, as other prophets, priests, and kings had. He had full power to act as he did. *As God by an original and indefeasible right, and as man by appointment and delegation.* If it be not allow'd of Christ that he is God manifest in the flesh, he can't be the Messiah promised to the Jews, and prophesied of in the old testament. In *Daniel ix. 24, 25.* where the Messiah is expressly spoken of, he is call'd *the most holy*; an appellation that can't possibly suit any but the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. This same Messiah is spoken of by *Isaiah*, as the Lord of Hosts, the usual scripture title of the supreme God, *Isaiah viii. 13, 14.* Sanctify the Lord of hosts himself, and let him be your fear, and let him be your dread, and he shall be for a sanctuary: But for a stone of stumbling, and a rock of offence, to both the houses of Israel, &c. This, according to St. Peter's application of it, is spoken of Christ, *I. Pet. ii. 8.* So that 'twas really the Lord of hosts that the Jews took so much offence at. This same Messiah, or Lord of hosts, hath this farther august and adorable title given him by the same prophet, *Isa. ix. 6. viz. The mighty god. Unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given, and the government shall be upon his shoulder; and his name shall be called wonderful counsellor, the mighty God, the everlasting Father, the prince of peace.* Thus also he is stil'd by the same prophet, *Isa. vii. 14. Immanuel, or God with us.* And so again by the same prophet, *Isa. xl. 3.* he is stil'd, *the Lord our God*; which last prophecy by three of the evangelists, *Mat. iii. 3. Mark i. 3. Luke iii. 4.* is apply'd, as having a reference to our blessed Saviour; and in one of those evangelists, *John the baptist* is stil'd not only *the voice of one crying in the wilderness,*

derness, as he is by the other evangelists, according to the prophetic language, but also the prophet and forerunner of the highest, and one that should turn many of the children of Israel to the Lord their God, i. e. to Christ Jesus, Luke i. 76, 16, 17. So that if any deny the true and proper Godhead of our Saviour, they rob him of his highest prophetic character, and give up the cause of christianity to the Jews, and allow them all that they have been contending for these 1700 years and more, viz. that our blessed Saviour is not the *Messiah* that should come into the world.

If our blessed Saviour be but a mere man, as the Socinians speak, or if he be a superior being, but still a creature, as others contend, he can't be the *Messiah* spoken of in the old testament, nor that *Messiah* that the ancient Jews expected. * And if he be not, then, as the Apostle speaks in another case, *is our preaching vain, and the faith of christians also vain*; and it can't but be unsafe to depend upon him for eternal salvation. This consequence, I am sensible, will not be allow'd me; but yet however 'tis an easy and a natural one. For if the promised *Messiah* was to be *Immanuel*, or God with us, and our Saviour be not God, what can the conclusion be, but that he is not the *Messiah*, but some other person, infinitely inferior to him that was spoken of in the old testament? The argument to me is clear and conclusive. And this serves farther to shew, that 'tis far from being a matter of pure speculation, as some (to
 take

* Vid. Dr. Allis's Judgment of the Jewish Church, &c.

take us off from our concern for it) have represented it, but a matter of the *last importance*, and which we can't give up, but we must give up the *whole of christianity* with it. And I wish, that such as oppose our *Saviour's divinity*, or that seem to make but little of it, would a little more consider what advantage they give by their notions to *Jews and Deists* to reject *christianity*; for, I think, 'tis a very clear case, that if our Saviour be not *truly God*, he can never be the *true Messiah*.

And as I can't see how 'tis possible that Jesus should be the true Messiah, unless he be truly God, so neither can I, how he should be the *Saviour of the lost world*. This also is necessary to be believed; but can't upon any solid ground, unless it be own'd, that Christ is God: For as Christ undertook to be a Saviour, so one of the most difficult parts of his undertaking, was to satisfy divine justice. But with what reason can we imagine, that any creature can merit, or that one creature can merit, or satisfy for another? Or that the most exalted of created beings can atone for the transgressions of a world of Sinners? The scriptures give us a much more rational and satisfactory account of this matter. Here *sin* is represented as that which is infinitely offensive to God, and the *great Saviour* of sinners as one that was in the *form of God*, and thought it no robbery to be equal with God, but yet humbled himself and became obedient to death, &c. *Phil. ii. 7, 8*. Our case was such, as that we needed a Saviour that might be able to save us our from sins; and therefore it was fit (as the scripture represents it) that he should be *Immanuel, God with us, i. e.* God taking our nature, God manifest in flesh; and being

being such, there is no one can doubt, but he must be infinitely well qualified to reconcile and bring us to himself, *Mat. i. 21, 22, 23.* If our Saviour had been only of the seed of David, according to the flesh, and not God over all, blessed for ever, as he is said by the Apostle to be, *Rom. ix. 5.* he might indeed have been a sufferer, but I can't see how, as such, he could satisfy justice, or have been a Saviour: But this great transaction of man's redemption appears in a most beautiful and affecting light, when the Saviour of sinners is represented as one in whom dwell all the fulness of the Godhead bodily, *Col. ii. 9.* This method of our Salvation doth most effectually declare the divine righteousness, it sets God's concern for the honour of his laws and government in the strongest light, and must put it out of question with every person, that *God may be just, and yet the justifier of them that believe in Jesus.* This must convince, that our salvation is now in the safest hands, and that there can be nothing left undone on the redeemer's part to make us happy: But what doubts, and diffidence might we justly have been under, if our Saviour had been only a created being? I can't see how we could rationally persuade our selves, but the breach between God and us must be as wide as ever. If therefore the thing was calmly consider'd, it should methinks appear infinitely too much for any creature to save an apostate world from sin and death. If any finite being could save us, I don't see why one creature might not save us as well as another. They are all at an infinite distance from God, the highest angel, as well as the meanest worm. But our Saviour thought it no robbery to be equal with God; and this lays a sure foundation for our hope,

that he is able to save us to the uttermost; which they in effect must deny, that deny his Godhead, and thereby deprive poor lost sinners of their best and only support, both in life and death.

Farther, as such as deny the Godhead of our Saviour, do in effect deny that he is the *Messiah*, and Saviour of the world, so they must also in effect deny that he is the judge of the world. That Christ will be the judge of universal mankind is most plain. *The Father*, 'tis said, judgeth no man, but hath committed all judgment to the Son, that all might honour the Son as they do the Father, *John v. 22, 23*. And what honour can there be that he is not most worthy of that is to determine the eternal fate of all Mankind? I can't conceive how any finite being should be at all fit for this high station, or that highest honour that doth attend it: For if any act as the great and righteous judge of universal mankind, he must be able to search the hearts and reins, (a province peculiar to God himself, *Jer. xvii. 10. II. Chron. vi. 30.*) or else he could never render to men according to their works, *Rev. ii. 23*. The judge of all the earth must be qualified to act in the most impartial manner, and to do all men right; and that it may be thus, every work must be brought into judgment, with every secret thing, whether good or evil, *Eccles. xii. 14*. And must not this be attended not only with difficulties, but impossibilities, if he had not an all-comprehending mind, that is to have the management of the last judgment?

Let the matter be well and calmly consider'd, and how can it but be allow'd that there are innumerable things in the last judgment that must puzzle and confound a finite understanding?

Can

Can it be the Work of a *finite understanding* to know what every person is, and hath been, from the beginning of the world, to the end thereof? Can it ever be the work of such an understanding to know what *talents* every particular person hath been entrusted with, and what his several *improvements* and *neglects* have been? Is it possible that such an understanding should know what the different *tempers* and *temptations* of men have been? From what *principles*, and to what *ends* every one hath acted? What the various *circumstances* of all mankind have been? And what a *variety of changes* have been in these their circumstances? And what the several *impressions* have been that those their circumstances have made upon them? These, and innumerable things more, too many to puzzle all the angles in heaven, and every *finite understanding*, must be clearly & certainly known by the great judge of quick and dead. These innumerable things must be before him in *one intire and unmistaken view*, or else the judge must be at a loss whom to reward, and whom to punish; whom to reward with more or less glory, or whom to punish with more or less severity, But should our Saviour and judge be at the least loss as to any of this, he could never discharge the high and important office of *universal judge*. But so infinitely perfect is our judge, that there's not a sinner in the world that will have the least reason to complain of inequality. Known unto our judge are all persons, and all their works from the beginning of the world to the end thereof; and he that hath an understanding *equal* to this hath an understanding *equal* to every thing else. *His understanding is infinite in the strictest sense in*
which

which this term is ever apply'd to any being in the sacred scriptures, which, without doubt, is an *ascription* too high for any finite derived being, how excellent soever. This and the like are great and dangerous inconveniences that have ever hung so heavy upon those schemes that tend to depress our Saviour's worth and adorable excellencies; as that, tho' they have sprung up in almost every age since the beginning of christianity; yet after some time they have vanish'd and disappear'd again; and truth (in despite of all opposition) hath been triumphant: And thus I can't but hope it will be again, after error hath run its course a little longer, unless it should issue, as it hath, I fear, already done with respect to many, in notorious prophaneness, or in the common rejection of all christianity, and so God be provok'd to take his kingdom entirely from us.

But farther, when any deny the proper God-head of our Saviour, they do also in effect deny that he is the Son of God. That the scriptures do lay the greatest stress upon the belief of this can't be unknown to any that read their Bibles with the least attention. Our Saviour himself tells St. Peter, that this was the faith upon which he would build his church, viz. that he was Christ the son of the living God, Mat. xvi. 16, 18. This was the faith that Martha made a confession of to Christ himself, I believe Lord, says she, that thou art Christ the son of God; not only Christ, but the son of God, John xi. 27. This also was the faith that Philip insisted on, when the Eunuch had a desire to be baptized, Acts viii. 37. If thou believest with all thy heart, thou may'st. When therefore the Eunuch had declar'd, that he believed that Jesus Christ was the son of God, he was

was immediately baptiz'd upon this his confession. And this faith of *Peter, Martha, the Eunuch, &c.* is what the scripture doth represent as a matter of such vast importance, that we are told it is that *faith by which we must overcome the world, and obtain eternal life, I. John v. 5, 13. John iii. 16.* to which our Saviour farther adds, *that he that believeth not, is condemn'd already; because he hath not believ'd in the name of the only begotten son of God.* To believe therefore that Christ is the Son of God ought to be the faith of all christians, which may farther be concluded from that question our Saviour himself puts to the person that he had cur'd of his blindness, *John ix. 35. Dost thou believe on the son of God?* The question plainly implies the absolute necessity of such a Faith. It can't therefore but be of the greatest moment to know what the meaning of this phrase is in scripture. And here, I think, 'tis very certain, that the *Jews*, who were enemies, and the *apostles*, who were disciples, understood thereby, that Christ had the same *nature, excellencies, and perfections*, that the *Father* had. As the sons of men don't differ from their *Fathers* in nature and essential perfections, so neither did the *Son*, the only begotten Son of God, differ from his *Father*. Thus did *Tertullian* and *Novatian*, thus did the compilers of what is call'd the *apostles creed*, as also of the *Nicene* or *Constantinopolitan creed*, understand the expression. They stile Christ in this latter creed, *God of God, light of light, true God of true God, or very God of very God, begotten, not made, being of one substance with the Father, by whom all things were made.* Thus the church of old did receive and believe in Christ; and the solid grounds that they went upon

upon were, that Christ had all the *titles* and *attributes* of God; that he did the *works*, and was to receive the *homage* and *worship* that was due to the *supreme* God.

Our Saviour himself doth declare, *John* v. 17. *That God was his father, and that he and the father were one, John* x. 30. The Jews understood hereby, that our Saviour intended to signify, as 'tis plain he did, that he was one in power, and therefore one in nature, with the Father; and accordingly they charge him with blasphemy, because by these assertions he made himself God, and equal with God, *John* x. 33. *John* v. 18. We may observe, that our Saviour doth not deny but the charge would have been very just, if there had not really been such an equality: But as he thought it no robbery or presumption to be equal with God, so in both these chapters he endeavours to satisfy the Jews, that he had a just claim to this equality: For he tells them that there were no works that the Father did, but he did, or was able to do the same: That there was no honour that the father claim'd, but he had a right to claim the same. 'Tis certain, that our Saviour had a right to all the honour that was due from creatures to their great creator; because all things were made by him, and for him; yea not only things, but men. Not only men, but angels also, *Col.* i. 16, 17. He had also an indisputable claim to all the honour that was due from preserved creatures to their great preserver; because he upholds all things by the word of his power, *Heb.* i. 3. He had also a right to all the honour that was due from subjects to their great and almighty sovereign. But to the Son he saith, *Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever; a scepter of righteousness, is the scepter of thy*

thy kingdom, Heb. i. 8. 'Tis observable, that in this first chapter to the *Hebrews* there are several things dropt against that very odd and, I think, *blasphemous* notion, that Christ is an *angelical being*. For Christ is not only here represented as *having by inheritance a more excellent name than they*, but *all the angels of God are commanded to worship him*. The highest and most glorious of them, are but *ministring spirits*; but Christ is the glorious king that doth employ them about the affairs of his government. The angels in their highest capacity are but *creatures*; but Christ is the great author and original of *universal nature*: And thou Lord in the beginning hast laid the foundations of the earth, and the heavens are the works of thine hands, &c. the highest thing that is said of God in the sacred scriptures, and the very thing that is said of God most high, *Psal. cii. 24, &c.*

What the apostle offers upon this head of creation, *Rom. i. 20.* must, I think, be decisive. The invisible things of him, i. e. God, from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even his eternal power and Godhead, so that they are, i. e. the gentiles are, without excuse; because that when they knew God, or might so easily know God, they glorified him not as God, verse 21, &c. As therefore these things are ascrib'd to our Saviour, so they are abundantly sufficient to distinguish him from angels, and all created beings whatsoever; or there is nothing in reason or scripture that is so. When we are arguing with *atheists*, who deny the being of a God, one thing that is commonly and very justly offer'd, to shew the folly and absurdity of their notions, are these visible footsteps of a divine being that are seen

in the being, contrivance, and government of the world: But if our blessed Saviour, the Son of God, the great author and governour of the universe, be a finite precarious being, there is nothing in the argument: For, according to this notion, there is nothing that we see, nothing that is done under the sun, but what a creature may do; which if it should be allow'd, as it can't in any reason be, it must overturn all religion; of such pernicious consequence is it to deny the *deity* of our *blessed Saviour*. By denying this, we give up *reveal'd religion* to the *deist*, and *natural religion* to the *atheist*. And I can't pass this over without this melancholy remark that *deism* and *atheism* were hardly ever known to spread so fast and far, especially in these nations, as they have since so many bold attempts have been made to rob our *Saviour* and *Sanctifier* of their *Godhead*.

We must then give up our bibles, or own Christ to be the Son of God, *i. e.* as the *Jews* by our Saviour's own allowance did justly interpret it, *equal with God*, or one that hath the same essential perfections that the father hath. This truth is as fully and frequently prov'd, and as much stress laid upon it in the sacred scriptures as any article of faith whatsoever. So that we may with as much reason and safety reject Christ under every other character and notion, yea and reject every article of christian faith besides, as well as this, that Christ is the Son of God, or of the same nature and perfections with the Father. There is as much reason to believe this as that Christ was incarnate, that he was conceived by the Holy-Ghost, that he dyed a sacrifice for our sins, and rose from the dead for our justification.

tion, that he acts as our advocate in heaven, that he is an all-sufficient and compleat Saviour, that he is the Messiah that should come into the world, that there is forgiveness of Sins to be obtain'd, that there will be a resurrection of the body, that Christ will judge the world in righteousness, and will determine all mankind to an eternal life of happiness or misery. All these things are most true, have a sufficient foundation in scripture, and ought to be receiv'd by all christians: But then 'tis as true that Christ is the Son of God, and therefore *God, God over all, Rom. ix. 5. the great God, Titus ii. 13. the true God, I. John v. 20. and our God, John xx. 28.*

Under the last mention'd character he was solemnly own'd by *St. Thomas*. On which acknowledgement of *St. Thomas* I would ask, how it is possible that Christ should have approv'd of such a confession of faith, as we may observe he doth, *John xx. 29.* If more had been ascrib'd to him than was his due? If *St. Thomas* had not been right in ascribing that to him that we dare not ascribe to any created being, how great soever, can it be thought that our Saviour would not have corrected him? Can it be thought, if our Saviour had been too much magnified by his apostle, that ever he would expect as he doth, verse 31. that this faith of *St. Thomas* should be the faith of all his disciples? No, if this was not to be, or fit to have been the faith of christians, Christ would have set his apostle and others at rights, when he was about to leave the world. But we are told, *That these things are written, i. e. the things in this gospel, by St. Thomas here, and in other parts of it, viz. That Christ was*

with God, and was God, and was equal with God, and one with the Father, that all things were made by him, and that we are oblig'd to honour him as we do the Father, &c. These things are written that we might believe, that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, and that believing we might have life in his name. This is what we must believe; to which I'll venture to add, that we have as much reason to believe this as we have to believe the Godhead of the Father, and that we may as justly and safely deny his divinity and perfections as those of the Son. We have no arguments to prove the one that we have not to prove the other. Yea, this important branch of the christian faith, which Mr. P—ce in his catechism, and Mr. H—t his admirer make nothing of, but plainly deny, is prov'd by a greater number and variety of arguments in the sacred scriptures than most others, if not than any other. This makes it clear to me, that we ought not only most firmly to believe it, but disclaim all religious communion with those that can't hold communion with us in this faith, and also endeavour by all meek and christian ways that it mayn't lose its place, its reputation, its ancient and just regard in the christian scheme. If it should, I think a great part of christianity must fall with it. Thus it hath been, and thus, I am perswaded, it must be, wherever this truth loseth ground.

For, farther, it must very much sink our regards to him, and alter the whole tenour of our carriage towards him. If it be allow'd that our Saviour is God, then it appears to be (what we ought to acknowledge it to be) a most surprizing instance of grace and love both in the Father and the Son, that he, who was
God

God over all, should be manifest in flesh for such worthless sinners as we are. This argues such a boundless love and condescension as can't possibly be parallel'd by any instance. But how prodigiously must it lessen the grace and love, and weaken the influence it should have upon us, if Christ was only a *poor finite being*? Yea, what creature is there but would undergo, if possible, all that Christ did, to be at the top of *honour and happiness* as Christ is? 'Twas the *freeness and disinterestedness* of Christ's love that doth so abundantly magnify it. As Christ was the only begotten son of God, so if we take this phrase in that *high sense*, in which I have prov'd it is us'd in scripture, he could never propose to be more glorious and happy than he was. This therefore sets a most admirable lustre on his love, that, *being in the form of God, he would take upon him the form of a servant, &c.* But if we reduce Christ to the *mean condition* of a creature, I don't see how we can have these high and exalted thoughts of his love that we ought to have: And if we have not, the *christian religion* must lose much of that influence that it ought to have upon the hearts and lives of men. *The love of Christ* is likely most effectually to constrain us, if we consider him as one that hath *all excellency*: But if we consider him as having nothing higher than *created excellency*, what a weakness must it throw into the impressions of Christ's love, and what a signal disservice must it do to the interest of religion?

In this case, 'tis certain, we can't be safe in *loving our Saviour with all our heart, mind, and strength*. Such a superlative love can never be due to any finite being. There is no such being that can have excellency sufficient to deserve it,

it, nor is it possible that we should be oblig'd to pay it; and no more is it possible that we should be oblig'd to put our confidence in such a being, and depend upon him for all that's *good* in this world, and all that's glorious in another. If Christ be but a *creature*, or *finite being*, which is the same, we must love him, fear him, trust in him, &c. only as such: But then this doth not any way come up to the demands of the christian religion. From which 'tis plain that our notions of Christ must determine in a great measure the *scheme of practical religion*; they must enter into a great many parts and instances of our behaviour. And this some of the *Socinians* themselves were so sensible of, that they were not more severe in censuring those that own'd Christ's *deity*, which they deny'd, than they were in censuring those that worshipp'd him, when they own'd him to be no other than a creature. They look'd upon this (tho' in their own party) to be a *monstrous absurdity*, and *worse*. They thought that as Christ was no higher than a creature, so he could deserve no more than was due to a creature; and in this undoubtedly they reason'd right: But then they reject'd at the same time all the commands that we have to worship Christ, to honour and put our trust in him, and to love him with a superlative and most intense affection; and by this means they alter'd the *whole scheme of christianity*, and made it a quite different thing from what God made it: But still, were more consistent with themselves than those who deny'd his *Godhead*, and yet paid him these *high honours* that were due to God, which none may venture to do, but those who believe him to be
so

so. But then, as we are requir'd, under the most awful penalties, to do this, this plainly shews the great danger of renouncing this *grand article* of the *christian faith*, viz. *That Christ is God*. And, for my part, I could never see how any can *make shipwreck of this faith*, but they must also *make shipwreck of a good conscience*, in a great many important instances of christian practice. So that the difference between us and others is not about a *notion*, or *speculation*, which may be safely embrac'd and as safely rejected, or which we may be *indifferent* and *unconcern'd* about : For the doctrine in difference between us does plainly affect a great part of *practical christianity*. If any think meanly of their Saviour, they can never, I think, discharge the obligations that they are under to him. And this must be my apology, that I have been so large in laying open the *ill tendency* of that *principle* that too many have embrac'd, and have been encourag'd to embrace by Mr. P--ce's *catechism* and Mr. H---t's *writings*, viz. *That the Father only is God*, and that our *blessed Saviour*, in the strict and proper sense of that word, is not so. And I hope that what I have offer'd is sufficient to establish those in the *truth* that are not yet perverted; and I heartily wish that it may be of any service to bring *those to repentance*, and to the *acknowledging of that great truth* that they have oppos'd and rejected, and by their opposition to which they have done so *manifest a disservice*, not only to the interest of *truth and peace*, but *vital godliness*, which can never be supported in some of its *main branches* where this *truth* is deny'd,

Remarks

Remarks on Mr. H—t's tenth discourse; wherein his notion of saying grace, and applying it to the Lord's-supper, is shewn not only to be groundless, but to have an ill tendency as to religion, and particularly to bring the Lord's-supper into contempt; and wherein also St. Paul is vindicated from a very infamous reproach that is cast upon him.

MR. H—t, in settling the signification of the word *grace*, in the beginning of this chapter, is pleas'd to observe, ' that this word *grace* is borrow'd from the *Latin gratia*, which signifies *thanks*. ' I shan't envy him the honour of this his *criticism*; but yet shall beg leave to suggest, that seeing he brings *Luke ix. 16.* to support his notion of saying *grace*, it would have been more suitable to have try'd his critical skill upon the word *ευλόγησεν* in that passage; But this perhaps he saw, instead of answering his purpose, wou'd have overturn'd his notion; because this word is sometimes us'd for *praying*, or *wishing well to*; nor is it altogether unlikely that it may be so us'd here, because in some copies the word *προσευξάτο*, which strictly signifies *pray'd*, is us'd instead of *ευλόγησεν*. Farther, also I am inclin'd to think, that if the evangelist had intended the action of *thanksgiving* in this passage, he would not have said *ευλόγησεν αὐτὸς*, but *ἐν αὐτοῖς*; or *ἐπὶ αὐτοῖς*; nor would he, I apprehend, have said that Christ blessed the *bread*, but his *Father* for it. The meaning therefore of this scripture I take to be, that, as Christ was about to feed a very great multitude with five loaves and two fishes, so he either looked up to Heaven by invocation for a blessing, that they might be so multiply'd that
the

the five thousand that were to partake of them might all be satisfy'd, or else rather he so blessed them himself, and increas'd them so miraculously by his blessing, that *five loaves and two fishes* were not only sufficient to satisfy *five thousand*, but there were *twelve baskets of fragments left*, i. e. very probably a great deal more than the loaves and fishes amounted to before the *blef-sing*. That the word *ευλόγησεν* is us'd in this sense in the *septuagint* is undeniably evident from *Gen. i. 22, 28*. Nor will it follow that this is not the sense of the word here, because St. *John* useth the word *ευχαριστίας*, *John vi. 11*. for this word is not us'd by St. *John* to explain *ευλόγησεν* in St. *Luke*: For 'tis plain that our Saviour could never give thanks that the loaves and fishes were multiply'd, 'till they were really multiply'd, which was subsequent to Christ's action of blessing them: For he bless'd them first, and so they were multiply'd, and then, according to the *laudable custom* of the *Jews*, mention'd and approv'd by St. *Paul*, *I. Tim. iv. 4*. gave thanks and pray'd. This, according to *Josephus*, was the constant practice of the *Jews*; and highly probable it is, that blessing, prayer, and thanksgiving, as distinct in their signification, were all us'd by our Saviour upon this extraordinary occasion. This is certain that the word *ευλόγησεν*, and others that come from the same verb that this doth, are often us'd where acts of thanksgiving can have no place, as *Gen. ii. 3. Mat. v. 44*. Nor can I see any reason to think but *blef-sing* and *giving thanks* have a distinct signification when apply'd to the sacrament of the Lord's-supper.

I don't say that there is any mystery in blef-sing the bread and wine at the Lord's-supper:

W

But

But I think it can hardly be excus'd from *prophaness* to suggest, that all that a minister hath to do at the sacrament, in conformity to the example of his great master, is *only to render thanks to God for his creatures*. I can see no reason to allow it to be true, that all that's requir'd of us before our own meals is to give thanks to God for his creatures; but to say that this is all that is required at the sacrament is to make that *common* which Christ hath made *holy*. 'Tis to excuse the *loose Corinthians*, whom the apostle condemns for their irreverent attendance, and to condemn the *apostle*, who blames the *Corinthians* for their prophane carriage. Farther, if all that's requir'd when the Lord's-supper is celebrated is, that we bless God for his creatures, what can the apostle mean, when he says, I. Cor. x. 16. *The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ? The bread which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ?* According to the apostle, we are not to look upon the bread and wine in the sacrament as *common bread and common wine*, but as bread and wine that represent the body and blood of Christ. We ought not therefore to bless God only for bread and wine, but when we remember Christ, as we are oblig'd to do at the sacramental supper, we ought to be thankful for Christ, and thankful to him. We must be thankful to the Father, that he so loved the world as to give his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth on him should not perish, but have everlasting life. And we ought also to be thankful to Christ that he would make himself of no reputation, take upon him the form of a servant, &c. when yet he was in the form of God, and thought it no robbery to be

be equal with God. If we ought only to bless God for his creatures when we celebrate the supper of the Lord, what occasion could there be for that apostolical injunction, *Let a man examine himself, and so let him eat of that bread and drink of that cup?*

Farther; if we ought only to be thankful for creatures when we receive the sacrament, how can those be *guilty of the body and blood of Christ who receive it unworthily?* And how can those receive unworthily who don't discern the Lord's body? 'Tis astonishing that any one who reads the scriptures should speak so contemptibly of the Lord's-supper as Mr. H—t doth. And as to Mr. H—t's motion, p. 158. that the word *blessing* should be laid aside, I can't see the least reason for it, but a great many against it, 'till Mr. H—t is pleas'd to prove, that *Christ, his Apostles, and other ministers,* were mistaken, and us'd an improper word upon this occasion. But 'tis evident that they had other thoughts of the Lord's-supper than Mr. H—t hath: For besides giving thanks to God for his creatures, which is all that Mr. H—t thinks is incumbent upon ministers or christians when they celebrate the Lord's-supper, they look'd upon the bread and wine as *signs* of the greatest blessings that a guilty world can stand in need of, and as *seals* of these blessings to all persons that are rightly qualified; and accordingly were not only thankful for these invaluable blessings, but did set these elements apart from *common use*, (and as that which did represent Christ who purchas'd them for us,) or bless'd them, or consecrated them by earnest prayer to God, that he would bless them to their spiritual and everlasting advantage. And then moreover they look'd upon

this as they did the sacrament of baptism as a *federal ordinance*; and accordingly oblig'd themselves, when they receiv'd these *memorials* of their Saviour's death, that they would be faithful to Christ as long as they liv'd. They gave up their souls and all to Christ, in hopes that Christ would communicate of his grace and favour to them. The apostles were very far from making such a *trifle* of the Lord's-supper as Mr. H—t doth. They profess'd a holy fellowship with Christ upon this solemn occasion. They own'd him to be their *Lord* and *master*, and oblig'd themselves to be his *faithful servants*: Nor can I see how these can possibly excuse themselves from great *irreverence*, *prophaneness*, and *contempt of Christ*, and his sacred institutions, who don't act upon such solemn occasions as they acted.

'Tis certain that what the apostles did, the same did the *primitive christians*, who were their followers and disciples. The account that *Justin Martyr* gives, * of their celebrating the Lord's-supper is this. When the sacrament is administered, *Bread and wine* are offer'd, and then the minister according to the best of his abilities, sends up prayers and praises to him, i. e. to God, and the people signify their approbation by saying *Amen*, and then what is thus consecrated, is given and receiv'd by all present. The *primitive christians* us'd both petitions and thanksgivings, and besides they bound themselves by an oath that they would act as became the servants

* ἀρτος προσφέρεται καὶ οἶνος καὶ ὁ ποιῶν εὐχὰς ὁμοίως καὶ εὐχαριστίας ὅση δύναμις αὐτῷ ἀναπέμπτει, καὶ ὁ λαὸς ἐπυφνηεῖ λέγων τὸ Ἀμήν, καὶ ἡ διαδοχὴ καὶ ἡ μετὰλλοις ἀπὸ τῶν εὐχαρισθησάντων ἐκδω γίνεται.
apol. 2. p.98.

servants of Christ, and sung an hymn upon this solemn occasion to Christ as God, as *Pliny* says in his letter to the emperor *Trajan*, as I observ'd before, which we have preserv'd in the works of *Justin Martyr*, and when they had thus done, they concluded all, as *Tertullian* says, with prayer. 'Tis easy to observe, from this brief account, how different the method of the *first christians* was from that which Mr. H—t would bring into fashion, which would make the Lord's-supper to be no more than a *common meal*. Whether this be done by Mr. H—t with any design to make way for the introduction of a *ridiculous custom* of giving the sacrament to *infants* I can't say; but let it be done with what design it will, I am sure, it hath a tendency to bring the Lord's-supper into *contempt*, to take off that *solemn awe* that ought to be upon the spirits of christians when they attend this *great and important festival*, and to render that of little moment to our selves which was design'd to be of the utmost service to our souls.

But to return to the subject of saying grace, as Mr. H—t styles it. I don't deny but that we ought to give thanks before we eat, and that particularly we ought to be thankful on the accounts that Mr. H—t mentions, p. 188, 189. But then what Mr. H—t thinks in the last of these pages to be *proper*, tho' not (according to him) *commanded*, I think to be a *prescribed duty*, namely, that we ought to join petition to our thanksgiving. *Every creature of God, according to the apostle, is good, and nothing to be refused* (not blood itself, nor things kill'd by strangling, which Mr. H—t excepts) *if it be receiv'd with thanksgiving, for it is sanctified by the word of God and prayer*, I. Tim. iv. 4.

5. The apostle here useth two different words, *εὐχαριστίας* and *προσεύχης*, thanksgiving and prayer, to shew, contrary to Mr H---, that they are not the same, but ought to accompany each other. We ought to be thankful that God hath given us his creatures, remov'd the curse from them, and made them subject to our use; and we ought to pray that what God hath thus given, and subjected to our use, may be made salutary and serviceable to us. And 'tis very plain, I think, that the apostle would have us'd the same word, if he had meant the same thing. The difference therefore between Mr. H---, and me is, that he is forced to own that it is *proper*, and I think it to be a *duty*: But why Mr. H--- should make any distinction between meats, as in p. 187. when God hath taken all distinction away, is what I can't understand. The apostles indeed thought it adviseable that christians should abridge their liberty for some time, that they might not give offence, and therefore forbade things offer'd to *idols*, (which Mr. H--- doth not except, tho' most exceptionable) and *blood*, and *things strangled*. This apostolical decree was made in favour of the judaizing christians, who could not presently be wean'd from their *old religion*, which forbade a great many things as unclean: But then it was only a *temporary decree*, so the *pure* all things are [now] *pure*, *Titus i. 15*. There is *nothing unclean of itself*. Nor doth the apostle only say that every creature of God is good, but that *nothing is to be refus'd, if receiv'd with thanksgiving*. When therefore the apostle makes no exception, I don't know what authority Mr. H--- hath to make any, where there is no danger of kindling in persons any prejudice against christianity,

stianity, or drawing them into sin: And in this case it is adviseable not only to abstain from blood, &c. but other things also that were not excepted in the apostolical decree. For my part, I know nothing but we may use, *when sanctified by the word of God and prayer, and us'd with thanksgiving.*

And then when there is a proper occasion for practising these duties of *prayer and thanksgiving*, we should never be shy of the name of Christ. 'Tis not only a groundless, but, I think a very scandalous reproach that Mr. H—— hath attempted to fasten upon St. Paul, and no less scandalous a practice that he attempts to draw christians into, p. 186. He represents St. Paul as if he did not, and speaks of christians as if they ought not to mention the name of Christ, when they perform any duty in the presence and company of unbelievers. But whatever Mr. H—— may, St. Paul had too great a regard for Christ, and so should all Christians, to dissemble it upon any occasion that they are his disciples, and one whom they own to be the Lord and master. It could not but be well known to those in the ship that 'twas for the sake of Christ that Paul was sent a prisoner to Rome. His chain was an evidence who his master was, and what his suppos'd crime was. Farther, we find, that he was not shy to tell them himself, *that an angel of that God whom they did not own, but whose he was, and whom he served, had appear'd to him, and given him assurance, that their lives should be preserv'd.* And how meanly must we think of St. Paul, if through fear, or complaisance to those unbelievers that were in the ship with him, he should attempt to conceal his regards to Christ, for
whom

whom he had suffer'd the loss of all things already, except his life, which also he did not count dear unto himself; but was most willing to sacrifice it for his great master.

Farther, if St. Paul had done as Mr. H—t represents him, those unbelievers themselves would very probably have look'd upon him as of a little, sneaking, time-serving spirit, who, to secure their favour, would sacrifice the name and honour of his Lord and master. And besides, St. Paul could not have humour'd those unbelievers by any other worship than such an idolatrous worship as they themselves us'd. St. Paul and those unbelievers had different objects of worship: Must St. Paul then have feign'd himself a heathen, to please those heathens? No, his business as an apostle was to turn them, if possible, from these vanities to the worship of the living God. 'Twould have been a scandal to his character not to mention the name of Christ. And perhaps Mr. H—t won't find it so easy to tell how St. Paul's worship could have been acceptable or lawful without naming the name of Christ, when this very thing is so expressly commanded, *Ephes. v. 20.* or, how he and the other apostles could have spread the christian religion among heathens and others, if the name of Christ must not have been mention'd in their acts of worship. What noble work and what hopeful christians must missionaries of Mr. H—t's stamp make, if they should be sent to convert Infidels? Too many popish missionaries have been bad enough; but if the instructions of any should be drawn up upon what seems to be Mr. H—t's plan, 'twould be better, I think, to keep such missionaries at home, lest, instead of converting persons to christi-

christianity, they prove a greater reproach to the christian name than many *popish missionaries* have, who, instead of promoting the cause of christianity, have harden'd persons in their infidelity.

Mr. H—t seems sensible that it would be an objection against what he had advanc'd that there are a great many unbelievers amongst ourselves, and that, accordingly, if the name of Christ must not be mention'd where unbelievers are present, it must of consequence be shut out of all worship. To obviate this objection he is pleas'd to say, p. 186, 'That if things were rightly manag'd, none but the faithful should be present, inasmuch as all the publick prayers should be confined to the Lord's-supper, which should be celebrated every time christians meet in the church.' But where doth the scripture say, or so much as intimate, any thing of this kind? By the *faithful*, I suppose, Mr. H—t doth not mean all sincere believers, but such as profess faith in Christ, whether good or bad; tho' that expression that all publick prayers should be confined to the Lord's-supper seems to carry this sense, that none but pious persons, or those that are reputed such, should be suffer'd to come to our publick assemblies, unless he be for a promiscuous communion of good and bad, if they profess faith in Christ. I confess I can't so well tell what Mr. H—t means, that all publick prayers should be confin'd to the Lord's-supper. If he means that none should be admitted to publick prayers but such as are fit to come to the Lord's-supper, this is evidently a great mistake. The assemblies of christians ought to be open and free for all comers.

X

Thus

Thus they were in the apostles' time, when Mr H—, I suppose, won't venture to say but things were rightly manag'd, I Cor. xiv. 24. From this place 'tis plain that unbelievers might be present when the church was met together for *prayers and praises*; nay, many times their assemblies were made up of scarce any but unbelievers. Can we then think that the apostles were not wont to pray upon such occasions? Or that they admitted the Lord's-supper to such a promiscuous multitude? Or that in their prayers they did not mention the name of Christ, whose disciples they were, and whose religion and worship they attempted to propagate in the world? What hope could they have of profelyting the world to christianity, and to bring unbelievers to call on the name of Christ, if they did not call on this name themselves, or so much as mention it when unbelievers were present? If Mr. H— would not *confess Christ before men*, the apostles were never afraid or asham'd to do it; and it would have been a *scandal* to their character if they had.

Farther; if none but the faithful must be present at publick prayers, what need could there be that the apostle should speak so much about the regular management of their church-assemblies, that so unbelievers *might be convinc'd when they came into them, fall down on their faces, and worship God, and report that God was among them of a truth*, I. Cor. xiv. 24, 25. ? There is nothing can be plainer than that unbelievers might be present in their religious assemblies: And if this had not been permitted, they would most probably have continued unbelievers still. But then they were never permitted,

if

if known, to be present at the Lord's-supper. This ordinance was never design'd for any but such as did own Christ, and profess submission to him. *The bread*, says the apostle, *that we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ?* For we, being many, are one bread, and one body; for we are all partakers of that one bread, I. Cor. x. 16, 17. The apostles did evidently make a distinction between the *Lord's-supper* and other ordinances, and so they did also in the first and best ages of christianity. They allow'd any that would to be present at their *prayers* and *preaching*; but when these were ended, and they began to administer the *Lord's-supper*, then all *unbelievers*, yea their *catechumens* and *penitents*, and all besides the *faithful*, were wont to withdraw. So that tho' they celebrated the Lord's supper frequently, yet all prayers were not confin'd thereto: For when the *unbelievers*, *catechumens*, and *penitents*, were withdrawn, then they had other prayers at the Lord's-supper that were more particularly suited to that solemnity. Thus they were wont to manage their publick assemblies in the *primitive times*. And this was so agreeable to scripture-direction, that Mr. H—t, I believe, will hardly pretend to put the world in a better way. I am sure, his own way must be very irregular and unscriptural, if at the Lord's-supper he only thanks God for his creatures, which is all that he seems to think necessary, p. 185.

We ought, I think, to do more than this at our own meals. There must be *prayer* as well as *thanksgiving* before we eat; nor should we forget to make our thankful acknowledgements to God after we have eaten and are full. Our

refreshment doth certainly deserve thanks as well as it doth that we have creatures to refresh us. Mr. H—t says very truly, p. 189, ‘ That some readers may wonder that he hath spoken all along of grace *before* meat only, and not of grace *after* meat also. The reason, as he says, is, because the scripture never speaks of the latter, as far as he knows; from whence it follows that christians are not bound in conscience to say grace *after* meat, tho’ they are oblig’d always to do it *before* meat.’ But this (with Mr. H—t’s leave) is no more a consequence, than it is that Women are not oblig’d in conscience to receive the sacrament, because they are not particularly mention’d in any of those scripture passages that relate to this subject. In many cases ’tis sufficient to bind the conscience that there are *general commands*, and that there is a *parity of reason* in the case. Now, by Mr. H.’s own acknowledgement, there are general commands that take in this case, as that we *should pray without ceasing*, and in every thing give thanks. To which I add Eph. v. 20. where we are requir’d to give thanks to God *always for all things*, and therefore for our refreshment, nourishment, and satisfaction by his creatures, as well as for the creatures themselves: Nor are there any besides these *general commands* for giving thanks *before* meat any more than *after* meat. What the apostle says in reference to this case is, *that nothing is to be refused if it be received with thanksgiving, being sanctified by the word of God and prayer*. This plainly enough intimates, that prayer and thanksgiving must both be us’d at our ordinary meals: But the apostle doth not say whether it must be *before*, or *after*, or *both*, and therefore I think
it

it must take in *both*, when there is the same reason for one as for the other.

But if men are not bound in conscience to say grace *after* meat, as Mr. H---t says, how could he say, 'that this practice is needful to keep up the remembrance of God and religion as much as possible in all ages, and especially in the present age, &c. And that therefore he is not for laying the present practice aside, but that he would heartily encourage christians to continue in it, &c.' But where's the *consistency* of this, that this practice is needful, &c. and yet christians not bound in conscience to this practice? Are not christians bound in conscience to do what's needful to keep up the remembrance of God and religion in the world? Farther, if christians are not bound in conscience, then however needful this practice may be, 'tis still no more (according to Mr. H---t) than a work of *supererogation*. And moreover if they are not bound in conscience, then there can be no sin in the omission of it. And how vain is it to say, that he would heartily encourage it, and yet tell persons, that it is no matter of conscience? Mr. H---t could never rationally expect that this practice should be continued, whilst he hath taken upon him to discharge persons from all obligations of conscience as to this matter: But 'tis very odd that Mr. H---t should give forth his *dispensations* in such a loose age as he esteems the present to be, and odder still that he should pretend to do it, when, by his own allowance, there are *general commands* to this purpose. Don't *general commands* that take in all particulars oblige the conscience? If not, we must give up, as I have shewn, saying grace *before* meat, as well

well as *after* meat, and also several other parts of religion besides. But persons have no need to be taught such principles of *libertinism*; they run too fast into them of their own accord. But Mr. H—t seems resolv'd to talk something new, and out of the common road, let the consequences as to religion be what it will, and whether there be any thing of solid reason, or in scripture, to support it or no.

Mr. H—t's *eleventh discourse* examin'd, and his notion of an *earthly paradise* expos'd, and prov'd to be directly contrary to what the scripture offers concerning the place where good men shall dwell after the resurrection.

There is no one that reads this discourse of Mr. H—t's with any attention but must observe, that one great design of it seems to be to slur those accounts that most divines have given of the future state and happiness of good men. These have represented it as a state wherein those who were good in this world shall be perfect in holiness, and perfectly blessed in the full and eternal enjoyment of God in *heaven*: But Mr. H—t says, p. 198, 'That heaven never once in all the bible signifies the place where good men shall dwell after the judgment day; and in asserting this he says he'll venture to be pretty positive, because he hath examin'd every place of the new testament with a view to this.' He allows, p. 191. 'that the souls of good men, when they die, do immediately pass into heaven: That they have at present their habitation in paradise, which is the same as heaven. That they are now with Christ, who

is

' is at present in heaven; but that neither Christ
 ' nor they must continue any longer there than
 ' till the restitution of all things, and that then
 ' both will have an earthly paradise, such as *Adam*
 ' had before the fall, together with some other
 ' glorious circumstances of bliss, p. 198, 199.
 And so fond is Mr. H— of this his notion, and
 so great a stress doth he lay upon it, that he
 intimates, p. 198, 200, that we can't without
 coming into his notion give any rational ac-
 count of the resurrection, nor have any possi-
 ble notion of the future state, unless St. *John's*
 description of the new earth in the *revelations*
 be in most particulars a literal description :
 ' For what notion (says he) can we have of
 ' it according to the common way of mens
 ' talking about it? i. e. as I, and all I believe,
 must understand him, when they represent it as
 a state of the most *sublime and spiritual delights*,
 as a state the happiness of which doth chiefly
 consist in the most *perfect knowledge, love, service,*
 and *fruition* of God, in our *exact conformity* to
 him, and those most *exquisite transcendent plea-*
sures that must necessarily result from such a per-
 fect service of, and resemblance to God. Thus
 have persons been us'd to talk of the future
 happiness of good men, as also that they shall
 be subject to no sin or temptation, nor any of
 those miseries that spring from it. That they
 shall have bodies *made like unto Christ's glorious*
body, i. e. subject to no *pain, sickness, or death*,
 that need no refreshment, but are according to
 the apostle's description, I. Cor. xv. spiritual,
 glorious, powerful, incorruptible, and shall e-
 ver be employ'd in bearing such a part as they
 are capable of in the service of God, in which
 and these exquisitely refin'd pleasures that must
 necessarily

necessarily attend it, the chief happiness of the saints will hereafter consist.

Mr. H—t seems very much to slight this notion of happiness, except what relates to the body, and the miseries that we shall be exempted from; tho' he says that persons will be holy and perfected creatures, and that they will have pleasure, peace, and joy. For, says he, 'if we would have an idea of the state of good men after the resurrection, we have no occasion to seek for such a notion of it as is perfectly remov'd from all the ideas which we now have, as men are commonly taught to do.' His meaning must, I think, be, by those that represent it as chiefly consisting in joys of a spiritual nature: But, says Mr. H—t, 'when we have remov'd all the evils and inconveniences of the present state, we may conceive it to be like to this.' Now 'tis well known that here men do commonly esteem it their highest felicity if they have *sound bodies*, and nothing to annoy them, if they have *good company*, and *good entertainment*, and a *plenty* of every thing that is proper to gratify their sensible appetites. I can't see but 'tis a sort of happiness consisting chiefly in *regaling the senses* that Mr. H—t pleads for, and a *paradise*, tho' not the very same that *Mahomet* (or rather *Sergius the Arian Monk* his assistant) contriv'd for his disciples, yet very much of a complexion with it; containing in it a plentiful fruition of sensible delights; for he allows it to be such as *Adam* had, only somewhat more glorious. As therefore *Adam* had his *Eve* to be the companion of his terrestrial bliss, and a *fine curious garden* to entertain himself in, &c. so, according to Mr. H—t, it must be in the future world.

world; and being such a sensible happiness, we shall, according to Mr. *H—t*, p. 103. 'be able to conceive of the happiness of such a state, and shall be more capable of desiring to be admitted into it.' But this representation of the state of good men is, I think, very *gross* and *mean*, very different from, and vastly inferior to, what the scriptures give us of this matter. To make which evident, I shall enquire whether good men are to have their residence in earth or heaven, after the resurrection, and then shew that St. *John* hath not given us a *literal description* of the future state of good men in those chapters of the *revelations* that Mr. *H—t* seems to build his *scheme* of a *terrestrial happiness* upon.

As to the enquiry then that I am to make whether good men are to have their residence in *earth* or *heaven*, after the resurrection, 'twould be a great discouragement to venture upon it, if strong and confident assertions were always true: But it sometimes happens, that men are very *positive*, and yet very much mistaken. And thus I must think Mr. *H—t* is, tho' he says, as I before observ'd, 'that the word heaven never once in all the bible signifies the place in which good men shall dwell after the judgment day, and that he'll venture to be pretty positive in asserting this, because, as he says, he hath examin'd every place in the new testament in which heaven is mention'd with a view to this.' I suppose Mr. *H—t* means that he hath examin'd this more *closely* and *critically* than others have, because he is so positive. For he can't think but others, whose hope, as the apostle says, Col. i. 5. *hath been laid up in heaven*, have examined this matter also,

Y

and

and thought they had sufficient ground to hope, that they should hereafter enjoy their happiness there where it was laid up for them. And how was it possible they should think otherwise, when the scriptures do constantly speak of the future and eternal happiness of good men as that which they shall enjoy in heaven.

To shew that the scriptures do thus speak, I observe, that when they speak of it under the character of an inheritance, 'tis spoken of as an inheritance that is incorruptible, undefiled, and that fadeth not away, reserved in the heavens for us, I. Pet. i. 4. Thus also when it is spoken of under the Metaphor of a citizenship, this citizenship is said to be in heaven, Phil. iii. 20. For our conversation, or citizenship, as the word πολιτευμα signifies, is in heaven. 'Twas here the apostles, and christians of his time, expected to enjoy the most glorious liberties of the children of God. Thus also when the happiness of good men is spoken of under the pompous metaphor of a kingdom, 'tis call'd not only a kingdom that can't be mov'd, Heb. xiii. 28, and the kingdom of God very frequently, and the everlasting kingdom of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, II. Pet. i. 11. but this everlasting kingdom of Christ is call'd by Christ himself the kingdom of heaven, Mat. v. 3, 10. And 'tis in this everlasting kingdom of heaven that the righteous are to sit down with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, Mat. viii. 11. 'Tis in this everlasting kingdom of heaven that such as are revil'd and persecuted for Christ's sake are to have their great reward, Mat. v. 12. And 'tis very odd, I think, to say, that they are to have this reward in heaven for a little while, and afterwards eternally on earth. 'Tis a heavenly kingdom

dom that God hath made us the expectants of, *II. Tim. iv. 18.* And therefore to talk of a kingdom on earth, is to talk in a language that the scriptures know nothing of.

Farther, when the scriptures speak of the happiness of good men under the *shining image of a crown*, they call it *a crown of life, a crown of glory, an incorruptible crown, a crown of righteousness laid up for those that love Christ's appearance, II. Tim. iv. 8.* And where should it be laid up but in that heavenly and most glorious world above? Farther; when the scriptures speak of it under the *metaphor of a country*, 'tis call'd *a heavenly country, Heb. xi. 16.* And so also when they speak of it under the *metaphor of a substance*, 'tis call'd *a substance in heaven*, and that of an *enduring nature, Heb. x. 34.* In like manner, when the future happiness is spoken of under the *metaphor of a treasure*, 'tis call'd *a treasure in heaven, Mat. vi. 20.* There christians are exhorted to *lay up treasures for themselves in heaven*, and to set their hearts upon these treasures, as treasures that they shall enjoy for perpetuity. To the same purpose christians are exhorted that they should *prepare themselves bags that wax not old, a treasure in the heavens, that faileth not, Luke xii. 33, 34.* If Mr H—t's notion be true, the exhortation would more properly have run thus: Lay up for yourselves treasures on earth; for tho' Mr. H—t allows that believers shall reside in heaven for some time, yet the time of their residence here is so very short, that 'tis as nothing to that vast and never-ending duration, that (according to him) they shall have on earth. But such an eternal duration on earth is never once propos'd as an encouragement to christians, or so much as

mention'd in the sacred scriptures. On the contrary, our Saviour, to encourage persons to part with their earthly possessions, and take up their cross for his sake and that of a good conscience, tells them, that if they would do this *they should have treasures in heaven*, Mat, xix. 21. Luke xviii. 22. Now, all that our Saviour meant by these plain expressions (according to Mr. H—t) must be, that they should have a short stay in heaven; and afterwards an eternal inheritance on earth. But is it not unaccountable that if this was our Saviour's meaning, that he should never drop any thing of this kind, never use expressions that so much as seem to carry this meaning, never acquaint his disciples that tho' he had spoken so much of *heaven*, he meant no more than an *earthly paradise*? But this was so far from what our Saviour meant, that he tells his disciples, when he was about to leave them, *that he was going to prepare a place for them, &c.* I would ask, whether it was not in *heaven* that our Saviour went to prepare this place? and whether the disciples could understand any other than that they were to have their rest and eternal residence with Christ in that glorious place that he was going to prepare for them? 'Tis undeniable, I think, that the disciples must thus understand our blessed Saviour. They had been directed by him before to *lay up treasures for themselves in heaven*, to set their hearts upon these heavenly treasures, to expect the full and final reward of their labours and sufferings in heaven: When therefore our Saviour here says *that he would come again and receive them to himself*, I can't see what our Saviour could mean, or his disciples understood hereby, than that they should have the

the full enjoyment of himself and those treasures that they had laid up in heaven, in that glorious place that by his blood he should purchase and prepare for them.

'Tis likely that all the disciples did thus understand our Saviour. 'Tis certain that St. Paul did thus understand, and hath thus interpreted, our Saviour's meaning: For when he speaks of the happiness of good men under the *metaphorical notion of a house or habitation*, as our Saviour doth, he assures us *that when the earthly tabernacle is dissolv'd, we have a building with God, a house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens, II. Cor. v. 1.* What can the apostle mean by *eternal in the heavens*, if we are only to have a temporary and very short residence there? Why, according to Mr. H—t's rate of interpretation, one would imagine that *temporary* and *eternal* must with him be the same thing. But it looks, however, as if he did not know what to make of the word *eternal*; and therefore, in quoting the passage p. 194. he leaves it out. But is this a *fair and justifiable way* of treating the scriptures, to throw aside such parts of them as can't be reconcil'd to our notions? After this rate the scriptures are nothing but what bold and confident men are pleas'd to make them, a mere *image of wax*, which such *interpreters* may mould into what shape they please. They are to be brought to their *notions*, not their own *fancies* to be try'd by them. And if Mr. H—t had not taken this *insufferable liberty*, he could never have attempted to explain the 1st Verse by the 2d, and make the apostle talk *nonsense*, the better to support his own *dream of an earthly paradise*. For how inconsistent is it to talk of *a house not made with hands, but eternal in the heavens,*

heavens, and in the same breath to talk of a house eternal on earth? But tho' Mr. H—t thinks fit to talk thus, the inspir'd apostle was more consistent: For that which he desires in the 2d verse was, that he might exchange that earthly tabernacle in which he groan'd for that house eternal in the heavens of which he had spoken just before. He says nothing of a house that was hereafter to come down from heaven, perhaps after several thousand years, but a house in which he should be immediately discharg'd from all his present groans and sufferings; and this he calls a house from heaven, because 'tis glorious and immortal, suitable to the heavenly state, and such as Christ, the great lord of heaven and earth, was gone into heaven to prepare for his followers. If the apostle had any thing else in his desire, it might be, that if God saw fit he might not sleep in the grave, but that mortality might at once be swallowed up of life.

There is nothing odd and unintelligible in what the apostle says; nor is there any thing but what is so in what Mr. H—t offers about this matter. How unintelligible is it to talk, as Mr. H—t doth, p. 195. 'that the house, 'the hope, the inheritance, the substance, 'the treasure, the place prepar'd for believers, 'is now in heaven; and that when the new 'Jerusalem comes down, these things shall 'come down in and with it'? According to Mr. H—t, the new Jerusalem is a glorious fine place already built in heaven, having many gates and walls, an angel at each gate, having precious stones for its foundation, twelve gates of pearl, having a pure river that runs through it, and a tree of life growing on each side of it, its streets pav'd with gold

gold, &c. and that after the judgment-day this city will be transplanted from heaven to earth. Doth not such an interpretation expose christianity to the contempt of *infidels*? How many odd and unanswerable questions will they be apt to put, if these things are to be taken *literally*? Whereas if we take these things in a *metaphorical* sense, as a great many things in this mysterious figurative book must be taken, it takes away all occasion of *cavil* and *objection* from *infidels*, whether we take it as a *prophetical* description of the glorious state of the church of Christ in the latter days, or as a *metaphorical* description of the most glorious state of good men after the day of judgment. And that it must be taken in this *figurative* sense will, I hope, be plain from what hereafter follows, and particularly seems undeniable from these other representations that are here given of this city: For it is call'd the *tabernacle of God with men*, chap. xxi. 3. and in the 9th verse it is call'd *the bride the lamb's wife*, of whose ornaments and marriage with the lamb, and the marriage-feast that was held upon this occasion, we have an account chap. xix. 7, 8, 9. These *images*, 'tis plain, are very different; which shews, that whatever state it be that St. John is describing, his description must be *figurative*.

But so very fond is Mr. H—t of his *earthly* paradise, and his *new city*, that he would fain draw in St. Paul, St. Peter, and even our Saviour himself, to abet him in these his *whims* and *fancies*. But as to St. Paul, tho' he speaks of the happiness of Abraham and other believers, under the notion of a city, in the places Mr. H—t refers to, p. 195. yet the city that they look'd for was in a *heavenly country*, and not on

the earth, where they confess'd they were strangers and pilgrims. Nor is there any intimation, Heb. 11th, from the 10th to the 16th verses, where these things are spoken of, that they or the apostles expected that this earth should be metamorphiz'd, and brought back to the state of the old paradise; and that then they and the city in which they dwell should be brought down upon it. St. Paul had no such idle fancies. Mr. H---t says, *ibid.* that St. Paul agrees with St. John in the name of this city, Heb. xii. 22. But then St. Paul calls it the heavenly Jerusalem; and 'tis not what St. Paul says, but what Mr. H---t hath made him say, that hereafter it shall come down from heaven. But, after all, 'tis probable, as * Dr. Whitby observes, 'that heaven here is not primarily intended by the heavenly Jerusalem, but rather the church of Christ in its present gospel state: And that it is call'd the heavenly Jerusalem, *propter originem & finem*, as having its rise from heaven, and as leading to it; on which account, says he, the gospel-state is stil'd oft the kingdom of heaven.' But if we should allow it to refer to the future state of good men, because 'tis said that we are come to an innumerable company of angels, &c. Mr. H---t hath not told us what shall become of this innumerable company of angels after the day of judgment; he hath only found an office for twelve of them, who are to be as porters at his city gates; but what place the others will have, whether in heaven or earth, he hath not said. The scriptures don't intimate, that these shall quit their

heavenly Jerusalem, and come down to dwell upon the earth. *Ver. 10. Ver. 11. Ver. 12. Ver. 13. Ver. 14. Ver. 15. Ver. 16.*

* Dr. Whitby in locum.]

heavenly habitations, but give us ground to believe, that they and the saints shall hereafter make but one *heavenly and glorious society*, who shall ever be employ'd in the *same work*, and have their residence in the *same place*. And where can this be but in the heavenly *Jerusalem*, which is at present possess'd by them; and the spirits of just men made perfect? St. Paul, I think, hath not said one word, nor so much as given us the least intimation of an *earthly paradise*: But on the contrary says; *that we shall hereafter have a building with God, a house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens.*

And as St. Paul hath said nothing of an earthly paradise, so neither hath St. Peter. Mr. H---t says indeed, p. 193. 'That St. Peter agrees with St. John in the account of this new heaven, and new earth.' But if this be true; then neither St. Peter or St. John agree with Mr. H---t. St. Peter indeed speaketh of a *new heaven, and a new earth, in which dwelleth righteousness*, II. Pet. iii. 13. But if this be the same with St. John's, then Mr. H---t's new heaven and new earth must be *creatures* of his own fancy and formation; and he hath the ill luck to have nothing like countenance from any of the apostles: For 'tis evident that St. Peter's new heaven and new earth were to have their existence before the general conflagration. For tho' they are mention'd in the chapter after the conflagration, yet it won't follow from hence that they were to be after it in time: Yea 'tis certain, I think, they were not; because the new heavens and the new earth St. Peter speaks of were such as God had promis'd. Observe (says Mr. Mede upon this place of St. Peter) 'according to his promise; But where

Z

(says

(says he) ' was this promise of *new heavens and a new earth* extant (when *John* had not yet seen the revelation) except that of *Isaiah*, chap. lxxv. 17: and lxxvi. 22. ' * In both these places God was pleas'd to promise the *Jews*, to whom *St. Peter* also writes, that he would create them a new heaven and a new earth; and that when he had done this they should rejoice in what he had created, and that he would rejoice in *Jerusalem*, and joy in his people, &c. That they should build houses and inhabit them, and plant vineyards, and eat the fruit of them; and that as the new heavens and the new earth so should their seed and their name remain; and that then from one new moon to another, and from one sabbath to another, should all flesh come and worship before him, *Isa.* lxxv. 18, 19, lxxvi. 22, 23. these were the ἐπαγγελματα, or promises, as the reading is *Stephens's* δ and *Alexandrian* copies, that *St. Peter* refers to. To *St. John's* revelations he could not refer, because these were not extant till towards the end of the reign of *Domitian*, which was about the year 90, whereas *St. Peter* suffer'd martyrdom in the reign of *Nero*, about 20 or 23 years before. And besides, *St. John* doth not speak of the new heavens and new earth by way of promise. The promises then that *St. Peter* speaks of must be those that were made to the *Jews*, and were not then fulfill'd, but would be fulfill'd in their proper time, and time enough to declare God's glory among the gentiles, to *Tarshish*, *Pul*, and *Lud*, *Tubal* and *Javan*, and the isles afar off, that had not heard God's name or seen his glory, *Ija.* lxxvi. 19. and therefore before

before that general conflagration that he had mention'd before, which would burn up the world and the inhabitants thereof, if any remain'd. So that tho' St. *Peter* mentions the conflagration first, and the new heavens and earth afterwards, he must be understood, I think, as Dr. *More* understands him; viz. 'But yet notwithstanding, or nevertheless, before this conflagration of the earth, we, according to his promise, or promises, expect new heavens and a new earth (in a political sense) in which righteousness dwells.' † According to this interpretation we can make sense of St. *Peter*, but according to Mr. *H--t's* we can make none at all, there being no promise that St. *Peter* can refer to but those that God was pleas'd to make to the *Jews*. And therefore for Mr. *H--t* to talk of the *matter* and *form* of his new heavens and earth, is to talk of something that St. *Peter* never thought on. There can be nothing in nature more different than St. *Peter's* and Mr. *H--t's* new heavens and earth. Neither therefore St. *Paul* nor St. *Peter* do lead us to conceive of the state and happiness of good men as Mr. *H--t* doth. They had *higher* and *nobler notions* of both, and such as had a much better tendency to promote *inward* and *vital religion*.

But so very much set is Mr. *H--t* upon his new earth, (for of his new heavens he says very little; not so well knowing, I suppose, what use to put them to) that he speaks of our Saviour also as encouraging his disciples to expect it, *Mat. v. 5. Blessed are the meek; for they*

Z. 2

shall

shall inherit the earth. But this promise, as it is taken from *psalms xxxvii.* where it is twice mention'd, ver. 9, 11. so we have reason to think, that by *earth* our Saviour meant much the same that *David* did, who, 'tis plain, understood thereby *this earth*, or the *land of Canaan*. The *earth* then taken as signifying present enjoyments our Saviour says the meek should inherit : By which he doth not mean that they should have large portions of it, that they should raise great estates, add house to house, and field to field ; no, I allow it to be true, what Mr. H—t observes, p. 202. ' that the meek are often losers. ' The worst of men have often the largest share of this earth. But then *a man's life consisteth not in the abundance of the things that he possesseth* : For tho' the wicked have many times the greatest possessions, yet as to the *manner of possession*, which is what our Saviour means, the meek have much the advantage of other persons. They enjoy what they have, be it more or less, with great comfort, rest, and tranquility of mind. If they have but little, they are as easy in that little, and abundantly more so than those who have the kingdoms of the world and the glory of them, if they are of a turbulent, furious, boisterous spirit. Thus do the meek truly *inherit the earth*, because they *delight themselves in the abundance of peace*, and because to them *the little that they have is better than the treasures of many wicked*, Psa. xxxvii. 11, 16. Nor is it any argument that that this is not our Saviour's meaning, because many or most of his other *beatitudes* relate to mens happiness in another world : For our Lord herein, as Mr. Norris * well observes,

seems

* Norris on the Beatitudes, p. 82.

seems to imitate *Moses*, who in his law had one commandment with a temporal promise, *Honour thy father and mother, that thy days may be long upon the earth, &c.* And so our Saviour here, *Blessed are the meek, for they shall inherit the earth*; not a new earth in another world; no, the future happiness of good men our Saviour in this very chapter calls *heaven*, and the kingdom of *heaven*, ver. 3, 10, 12. not the kingdom that is now in heaven, and will hereafter come down from God out of heaven: This is not what our Saviour says, but Mr. H—t's *pert and bold addition*, p. 201. for which he hath no foundation from what *St. Paul*, *St. Peter*, and our Saviour say. And besides, several of the promises our Saviour here makes have in part their accomplishment in this world, but will have their fullest and most glorious accomplishment in the kingdom of heaven.

But says Mr. H—t, with an *air*, p. 200.
 ' Where can the heaven be of which they
 ' speak? In the boundless space that surrounds
 ' us we know of nothing but suns, or fixed
 ' stars, earths, moons, and comets. Neither
 ' of these except the earths can be thought fit
 ' to be the habitation of good men in the fu-
 ' ture state: And why then should we seek
 ' for another unknown place, of which the
 ' scripture never speaks? ' But this is all *bounce*,
 or rather *blunder*. We seek for no other place
 but what the scripture speaks of, *i. e.* the *heav-*
enly Jerusalem, where our *citizenship* is, or the
celestial paradise that Christ is enter'd into, and
 where he is preparing a place for his faithful fol-
 lowers, and from which he will come to receive them
 to himself, that where he is there they may be also.
 This is the glorious place that we never saw;
 but

but what however we hope to see, when we see our Saviour as he is. And therefore as to Mr. H—t's question, Where can the heaven be of which they speak? I answer, In the same place where it is at present. And there is no question to be made that this is a place not only fit for *separate souls*, but for *souls embodied also*. In *heaven*, wherever it be, is the body that our Saviour assum'd. In heaven also are the bodies of *Enoch* and *Elias* (to say nothing of those Saints whose bodies came out of their graves after *Christ's* resurrection, *Mat. xxvii. 52, 53.*); and why heaven (as it now is) should not be as fit for our *bodies*, when they are made like unto *Christ's* glorious body, as they are for his own, and the bodies of *Enoch* and *Elias*, Mr. H—t, I believe, with all his skill in fixed stars, moons, comets, &c. can assign no reason: And therefore I can't but think it very odd in him to suggest, as he seems to do, p. 198. that unless there be an *earthly paradise*, there would be no resurrection: For says he, 'From this account of the place we see a plain reason why the bodies of good men shall be raised out of the grave; for without bodies, he says, they would not be fit to live on such an earth.' But do the scriptures ever give, or so much as suggest, this as a reason of the resurrection?

The scriptures do very frequently and expressly declare, that there will be a resurrection: And one reason of this is, *that men may receive the things done in the body, whether good or evil.* The bodies of good men are now employ'd as *instruments of righteousness unto God*, and the bodies of the wicked as *instruments of unrighteousness unto sin.* As therefore there is a day in which God will judge the world in righteousness, and

and render to men according to what they have done in the body, so all that are in their graves shall hear the voice of Christ, and shall come forth, they that have done good to the resurrection of life, and they that have done evil to the resurrection of damnation, John v. 28, 29. And as this shews us one reason of the resurrection, so another reason was to shew, that the great work of our redemption was compleated by Christ Jesus; that as in Adam all died, so in Christ shall all be made alive, I. Cor. xv. 21, 22. That as by man came death, so also by man should come the resurrection of the dead. And tho' it will be dreadful in the issue for the wicked to receive those bodies again in which they committed so much sin, yet the resurrection of Christ, as well as his death, was design'd for their good. And it can be charg'd upon no one but themselves, that both his death and resurrection were not of the most glorious advantage to them. The scriptures never mention such a reason as Mr. H—t doth for the resurrection. They put it upon a solid and rational, and not such a fanciful and groundless foundation as Mr. H—t doth. And, after all, why mayn't that heaven where Christ, Angels, and Saints, now reside be as fit for spiritual and glorious bodies, as hell is for the bodies and residence of the wicked? As therefore these may subsist, tho' not upon earth, so also may the bodies of the righteous too. And the apostle is express, that they have a house, not made with hands, eternal in the heavens; and from scripture we learn, that some embodied spirits have already taken possession of it.

The most then that I have farther to do as to this chapter is, to shew that St. John hath not given us a literal description of the place where

where good men are to have their future residence. Now, so far, I think, is St. *John* from this; that what is said of the new heavens and earth, &c. hath no reference at all to the future state, or what shall happen after the day of judgment. One thing that makes Mr. *H--t* think so is that series of events mentioned *Revel. xx. 21, 22. p. 196.* Now here I readily allow, that St. *John* speaks of the new heavens and the new earth after what he says concerning the judgment-day, chap. *xx. 12, 13.* But then it ought to be consider'd that St. *John* resumes what he had said chap. *xx. 12, 13.* in chap. *xxii. 7. Behold I come quickly: Blessed is he that keepeth the sayings of the prophecy of this book. And so again ver. 12. Behold I come quickly, and my reward is with me, to give every man according to his works.* So that what he speaks in chap. *xx. 13.* was not to come to pass till the appearance of the new heavens and the new earth, and the new *Jerusalem* coming down from heaven upon this new earth, and their disappearance again at the end of a thousand years. So that what was said of the last and final judgment chap. *xx.* was plainly spoken by way of *prolepsis* or *anticipation*, according to the method of St. *Peter*; where he first speaks of the things that should happen at the time of God's judging the world, and then acquaints us, that before this was done there should be new heavens and a new earth. St. *John* doth the same. So that what St. *Peter* declares by inspiration St. *John* had afterwards represented to him in a vision, together with several other things that St. *Peter* takes no notice of; particularly that there would be a new city upon this new earth, a city very stately and of great magnificence; of which

which city, and the new heavens and the new earth, the prophets *Isaiah* and *Ezekiel* had spoken before, as of blessings that the *Jews* would be favour'd with before the end of the world. The series of events is all, I think, that Mr. *H—t* hath to build his *hypothesis* upon. But 'tis common in *prophecies* (and *St. John's* is no other) to mix several things together, which tho' they will all come to pass one time or other, yet there is no necessity that they should happen just in the order that they are mention'd. And besides, there is nothing but what is very natural in the account that *St. John* gives of these affairs. I allow, that if *St. John* had said, that after God had determin'd men to their eternal states of happiness or misery, that then there should be new heavens and a new earth, there might seem to be some better foundation for some things that Mr. *H—t* says: But *St. John* neither says nor suggests any such thing. He only gives us an account of those several revelations that were made to him, some of them relating to another world, but most of them to the state of the church in this. And which of them belong to another world, and which to the present state of the church, must be gather'd from the expressions themselves, and not from the order in which they are related: For if this was always to be observ'd, then the final dissolution and judgment of the world, mention'd by our Saviour *Mat. xxiv. Mark xiii.* must have happen'd before the end of that generation in which our Saviour liv'd, because in the relation of it this comes after what our Saviour had said concerning the future judgment.

The order then in which things are related in the *revelations* can be no rational foundation

Root

to establish an *hypothesis* upon; and least of all can it be so, if there be some things said of the new heavens and earth, and the new *Jerusalem*, which are no way applicable to that place where good men shall hereafter reside. For as to the place itself which Mr. *H--t* hath assign'd as the *receptacle* and for the *residence* of good men, it seems (if literally describ'd) to be abundantly too narrow for all that are sav'd: For tho' those may be but few in comparison of the greater numbers that shall perish and be miserable forever, yet what is a city of twelve thousand furlongs to contain those prodigious numbers that shall be saved? For if twelve thousand furlongs contain the *area* of the whole city, as most probably it doth, then the *square* of it being one hundred and nine furlongs, this city will be considerably less than old *Babylon*, the *square* of which (according to *Herodotus*) was an hundred and twenty. Mr. *Potter* on the Number 666, and Dr. * *More* from him, do think, that the new *Jerusalem* of St. *John* doth bear the proportion of 12 to 25 to the city of *Rome*, as it was in St. *John's* time. We can't therefore think, that all the number of the saved should be crouded up in so small a compass. Nay, this seems impossible, if we allow, as I think we must, that their bodies will take up any space after the resurrection. 'Tis in this new *Jerusalem* (according to Mr. *H--t*, p. 196, 197, 198, &c.) that good men shall dwell forever. Mr. *H--t* takes no notice of any *country villages*, or *Towns*, or any other *city*, upon his new earth, where any of the saints might be *canton'd*; but they are all to dwell within the walls of the new *Jerusalem*, a place,

it

* Dr. *More's* grand *Myst.* of *Godliness*, p. 199, 197.

it seems, not half so big as the city of *Rome*. How irrational therefore must it be to understand *St. John* in a literal sense?

And then moreover, as the city it self is too narrow in compass, so if this city, taken literally, was to be the place of good mens residence after the day of Judgment, a wall great and high about it, with twelve gates, and twelve angels as *centinels* or *porters* to wait at them, would be perfectly unnecessary. The design of great and high strong walls, with gates and *centinels* to attend them, is to prevent danger. But what danger is there after the day of judgment, that the saints should be assaulted? or where are the enemies that should assault them, when they are all confin'd to the *lake that burns with fire and brimstone*? If it be allow'd that *St. John's* vision doth represent the state of the church in this world, the representation is easy and natural, because the church ever hath had, and will have enemies to the end of time: *But when Christ hath put down all rule, and authority, and power, and all enemies under his feet*, which will be done at or before the day of judgment, *I. Cor. xv. 24, 25*, the saints will enjoy a perfect and eternal security, and will never be in the least danger of being molested by enemies any more. 'Tis very odd therefore to talk, that the saints will dwell in a walled city, with gates, and porters at them, and that this is to be taken as a literal description of the *new Jerusalem*.

Farther, as I observ'd, there are other characters that are given of this city, which plainly shew, that the expressions concerning *St. John's* vision are *figurative*. Can it be thought, that if *St. John's* description of the *new Jerusalem* was to be taken according to its *literal* sig-

nification, and as denoting the place of good mens residence after the day of judgment, he would call it, as he doth, a *bride*, and the *lamb's wife*, and the *tabernacle of God with men*, *Revel. xxi. 2, 3, 9.* ? A *tabernacle* vvas that vvhich the *Jews* us'd as a place of vvorship vvhilst they vv ere in their travels, and 'till all their enemies vv ere subdued, as they vv ere not 'till *Solomon's* time. The metaphor therefore plainly refers to the church vvhilst it is in a militant and an unsettled condition; which it will no longer be when once the day of judgment is past. And then can a city with walls and gates be call'd the *lamb's wife* in a literal sense? 'Tis undeniable that by the bride is signified *Christ's faithful disciples*, who are join'd to *Christ* as a bride to her husband, not after, but before the day of judgment. Farther, if the *new Jerusalem* that *St. John* speaks of will be the place of good mens residence after the day of judgment, how can it be said that the *gentiles shall walk in the light of it, and the kings of the earth and the gentiles shall bring their glory and honour into it, chap. xxi. 24, 26.* ? What distinction vvill there be betvv en *Jews* and *gentiles* after the day of judgment? Or vvhat kings vvill there be vvhen this judgment is past to bring their glory and honour into it? These expreffions, methinks, put it beyond all doubt, that vvhat *St. John* says of the new heavens, and the new earth, and the new *Jerusalem*, relates to the church on earth, and to that state of it particularly that *St. Paul* speaks of *Rom. xi. when all Israel shall be saved, and the fulness of the gentiles shall be brought in.* Concerning this happy state of the church the prophets had spoken long before, and that in much the same language that *St. John* here doth:

doth: For as St. John speaks of *new heavens and a new earth*, so *Isaiah* useth the same expressions, when speaking of the conversion of the Jews, *Isa. lxxv. 17.* Again, as St. John says, *cha. xxi. 3, 4, that the tabernacle of God should be with men, and that God should be their God, and dwell among them, and wipe all tears from their eyes, &c.* so *Isaiah*, speaking of the happy state of Jerusalem in gospel times, and when God should again own her after her long rejection, hath the same expressions, *Isa. lxxv. 19. chap. xxv. 8. chap. xlix. 10.* And so also we find *Ezekiel* speaking to the same purpose, *Ezek. xxxviii. 26, 27.* Again, as St. John says, in describing the new Jerusalem, *that the building of the wall of the city was of jasper, &c. Rev. xxi. 18.* so *Isaiah*, speaking of the church, when Jews and gentiles shall be united in *one body*, and under one head, gives much the same pompous description of its then happy condition, *Isa. liv. 11, 12.* Thus also as St. John says of the new Jerusalem, *that there shall be no night there, and that the city had no need of the sun, &c. chap. xxi. 23, 24, 25.* so *Isaiah*, speaking of Jerusalem, when she shall be converted to God, says the very same, *Isa. lx. 19, 29.* Again, as St. John says of the gates of that Jerusalem that he speaks of *that they shall not be shut at all by day, &c. and that the gentiles should bring their glory and honour into it, Revel. xxi. 24, 25, 26.* so *Isaiah*, speaking of the conversion of the Jewish nation, and the accession of the gentiles to her, after this her conversion, hath the same expressions, *Isai. lx. 11, 14, 16.* Once more; as St. John speaks of the new Jerusalem under the character of a *bride adorn'd for her husband, Revel. xxi. 2, 9, 10,* so *Isaiah*, speaking of the Jewish church converted unto God, describes it under the same character, *Isa. lxi.*

10. lxii, 4. 5. And then concerning this new Jerusalem *Isaiab* farther says, chap. lii. 1. *that the uncircumcis'd and unclean shall no more come into it*; which exactly answers what *St. John* says of his new Jerusalem, *Revel. xxi. 27.*

Mr. *H—* is forc'd to own, p. 207, 208. 'That *St. John* borrow'd his language from *Isaiab*, tho' he says, that he speaks of other 'things.' But, methinks, nothing can be clearer than that they both speak of the same thing. And there is one thing more that farther puts it out of all question with me that *St. John* speaks of the state of the church in this world, and that is, that when he speaks of the tree of life, chap. xxii. 2. which grows on the side of the river which runs through his new Jerusalem, he says, *that the leaves thereof were for the healing of the nations.* Mr. *Brightman's* observation on this place which I have thrown into the margin, is, I think, very judicious and true, * *viz.* that there will be no difference between gentiles and others in the future world. That all there will be as the angels of God, having no wounds that need to be cured, and that therefore what *St. John* says can never be accommodated to the state of the blessed. And how can any think, if it could, as 'tis plain it cannot, that *St. John's* description of the new Jerusalem could be literal, when he says, *That the building of the wall of it was of jasper, and the city was pure gold like unto transparent glass?* chap. xxi. 18. *That the foundations of the walls of it were jasper, saphire, that it had twelve gates, and these twelve*
gates

* Non possunt ad ultimam conditionem beatorum accommodari, ubi nullum discrimen erit gentium et aliorum populorum, nec locus ullus erit sanandis vulneribus, quando quisque fuerit sicut angelus Dei. *Brightmanus* in *Apocalypsin*, p. 411.

gates were 12 pearls, and every several gate was of one pearl, v. 21? That in it was a pure river of water of life, clear as cristial, proceeding out of the throne of God, and of the lamb, and that in the midst of the street of it, and of either side of the river, was there the tree of life, which bare twelve manner of fruits, and yielded her fruit every month, and the leaves of the tree were for the healing of the nations? chap. xxii. 1, 2.

'Tis surprizing to me, that any should look upon this, &c. to be a literal description of the place where good men shall be after the resurrection. All that can reasonably be signified here (if it referr'd to the state of the blessed hereafter) is, that their state will be very glorious and magnificent: But I have made it, I think, evident, that St. John's vision relates to the church in that *last* and *glorious* period of it when Jew and gentile shall be united under their great shepherd and Saviour the Lord Jesus. And that which farther confirms me herein is, that Ezekiel who undoubtedly speaks of the state of the Jews, when they shall be converted, gives us much the same description of this city that St. John doth, Ezek. chap. xl. chap. xlviii. Mr. H—t says, they must be different cities, because of a different bigness: But this is a poor consequence where the descriptions are figurative, and will appear to be weaker still if we consider that Ezekiel had a principal, if not a sole regard to the Jewish church, and St. John to the church as comprehending Jew and gentile, happily united in one body; which as it would be more numerous, so it was represented to him in his vision as a more extensive, and therefore requiring a more spacious place to accommodate its members.

Upon

Upon the whole therefore I must think, that Mr. H—, if he had any design in writing books to serve the great and important purposes of religion, he would have serv'd them much better, if, in speaking of the state of good men after death, he would have spoken of it as others have done, and as the scriptures that are plain do speak of it. This might probably have dispos'd persons to *set their affections*, as they ought, *on things above, not on things on the earth*: But when persons shall be taught to carry their *views and expectations* no higher than an *earthly paradise*, and *carnal and sensual delights*, there is but little hope that they should be brought to endeavour after that *spiritual and divine*, that *refin'd and heavenly temper of soul*, that is absolutely necessary to qualify persons for the *sublime felicities* of an after-state. And I most earnestly wish, that this mayn't be the unhappy effect of what Mr. H. hath said concerning the place that's prepar'd for good men after the resurrection. God himself hath prepar'd a more noble and desirable state for pious persons. May every soul aspire after it, and make suitable preparations for it! And then Christ, who is gone to prepare a place for his people, will come again and receive them to himself, *that where he is, there they may be also*. To which most blessed state, even an inheritance that is *incorruptible, undefil'd, and that fadeth not away, reserv'd in heaven* for true believers, may vast numbers be brought through the rich grace and merit of *Christ Jesus*; to whom with the *Father*, and the *Holy spirit*, be ascribed, here and in all the churches, all power, and praise, glory, and honour. Amen.

7 AP 66
F I N I S.